

Exhibit B

Bruce L. Hay
1525 Massachusetts Ave.
Cambridge, MA 02138
bruce.l.hay@icloud.com
617.955.5955 (mobile)

June 8, 2020

David Korzenik
Miller Korzenik Sommers Rayman LLP
1501 Broadway #2015
New York, NY 10036

**Re: "The Most Gullible Man in Cambridge," *The Cut*, July 2019
"The Harvard Professor Scam Gets Even Weirder," *The Cut*, August 2019**

**OFF RECORD
NOT FOR PUBLICATION**

Dear Mr. Korzenik:

They are "demonic."¹ They are "vampiric." They are "terrifying." They are "sharks out for blood" who "suss out people's vulnerabilities and seize upon them." The man who lives with them was "stripped of his autonomy and his personality." They are ruled by an "asshole trans cult leader." They cast "spells" on men.

There can be only one word for these satanic creatures, who make so many memorable appearances in your reporter's correspondence with me. They are witches. And we all know that in the pursuit and exposure of witches, the usual rules of procedure, evidence and proof — and simple human decency — do not apply.

This is why your reporter was at liberty to cast aside the conventions that govern investigative journalism. It is why she has asked sources to help her "bring the two to justice."² It is why she has cheered on the lawyers leading the legal attack against the women, has recruited clients for them, and has urged them to seek federal criminal charges. It is why she boasts of humiliating women who "think they're smarter than everyone." It is why she hurls slurs at a trans woman of color, and hopes to see her lose her children and sent to prison as a result of the

¹ Except where noted, all emails and text messages quoted in this letter were sent by Kera Bolonik to me. The quotations in this paragraph are taken, respectively, from her correspondence of 3/7/19 (email); 1/28/20 (text message); 9/14/19 (text message); 8/29/19 (text message); email 10/30/19.

² Email 8/9/18. All other examples in this paragraph are documented in part III below.

articles. It is why she has suggested getting Harvard to punish the women for criticizing her work and telling their side of the story to another journalist.

It is also why your reporter has exploited the unhinged bigotry that so many people direct at Mischa Haider for the crime of being a transgender woman of color. People who have wished to harm this woman for personal reasons have long understood the power they have to threaten her and endanger her — a brown trans woman of foreign ethnicity — at the hands of law enforcement. That has been her experience with her husband Andrew's estranged sister Margaret, who never forgave her for the inexcusable fact that Andrew fell in love with a transgender woman. Since the spring of 2019, your reporter has become Margaret's latest avenue for taking revenge against Mischa, and Margaret has become your reporter's principal source. As your reporter knows, this individual once reported to the FBI that Mischa was the mastermind behind the Boston Marathon bombing.

It is also why the articles conceals so much information from the reader about the women's supposed "trail of victims." The lead article does not disclose, for example, that Jay Scuteri — whom the article calls John Doe — has been credibly, and publicly, accused of raping one of the women. He is allowed to hide behind the cloak of anonymity and his accusations are presented as established fact; the women are named against their will, and their side of the story is not told at all despite its ready availability in public legal documents. The article conceals from the reader that the accounts of the other two purported victims — Poe and Roe — are unsourced and completely uncorroborated. Your reporter never spoke to these men or anyone connected to them and rely completely on what I myself had told her. It conceals the evidence demonstrating that the entire "extortion, fraud and false accusations" narrative is the fictional creation of lawyers seeking to intimidate and silence the women.

This is also why the articles' editors were willing to run pieces that, on such flimsy evidence, effectively convict two women of being serial predators. If this work had been about a *man* accused of serial wrongdoing, there can be no doubt that the editors would have insisted on far more direct sourcing, and would have examined it with a far more skeptical eye, before wrecking the subjects' lives with an inflammatory story like this one. But in the case of these strange, nonconforming women, there was no need to take such precautions — call it journalistic due process — before destroying their lives. Everything about them is sinister. Proof of their guilt is everywhere, even in tales of men's innocuous encounters with them on the street. For such encounters only *seem* innocuous; in truth, as the editors observed, they are "weird and fascinating," and the men in question "dodged a bullet."³

This is why the lead article's photos of the women, which I took in ordinary social settings, were cropped and photoshopped to resemble mug shots that look nothing like them, activating the dark prejudices on which the case against them really rests. Dehumanizing the women in this way was precisely the point. They are less than human.

³ Email correspondence of Genevieve Smith and Ted Hart, forwarded to me in Bolonik email 7/25/19.

This is also why, as the editors told me, the garish cover photo was staged and designed to evoke "Hitchcock." The photo is an obvious allusion to *Psycho*, a movie set in a Victorian house nearly identical to mine, whose titular villain Norman Bates — in case you have forgotten — thinks he is a woman, and dons a dress before butchering his victims. Truthfully, I cannot imagine a better advertisement for these articles, which are after all little more than a horror movie featuring a villainous trans woman, depending for their effect on the same transphobic impulses so often exploited by the "slasher movie" genre that inspired them. Give the editors credit: they know their product.

This is also why my effort to call attention to all of this has met with a response that, in ordinary circumstances, would be considered outrageous treatment of a source. Upon receiving my April 23 letter challenging the accuracy of the articles and the conduct of the reporter, you immediately set about trying to frighten me into silence. You contacted my counsel in the civil litigation, making the false and defamatory accusation that I must be in the pay of (or under pressure from) the women, and threatened that *New York* would publish an article to that effect if I did not back off. You also contacted Jay Scuteri's counsel in the litigation, to say that I was "again" under the women's "spell."

Again under their spell.

When I followed up with a note objecting to these bullying tactics and seeking a written reply to my letter, you did write a reply — in which you attacked my "credibility" without explanation, threatened to publicize my off-record communications, and defended your reporter against my "attacks." You have not invited me to detail my concerns about the articles or to provide supporting evidence; to the contrary, you have gone to some lengths to discourage me from doing so. Perhaps that is because the people responsible for these articles — including those who vetted them for publication — would rather not know the details of what I have to say and the evidence I have to offer, and would rather no one else did as well.

These attempts to silence me are not going to work. More than once, your reporter has asked me, her source, to help her silence the women — proposing that Harvard's disciplinary machinery be deployed to punish them for the negative things they have said about her, and for their attempts to get their side of the story told by another journalist. I did not go along with those contemptible efforts to shut people up, and will not go along with yours. Quite the contrary. Your bullying only further convinces me of the need to dig further into the evidence revealing your reporter's misconduct and speak up about your magazine's immolation of a transgender woman of color and her family.

In the present letter I will discuss your own inappropriate and unprofessional response to the concerns I have raised; the way that transphobia, racism and misogyny have snowballed into the false narrative about the women that your articles represent; the myriad ways in which your reporter has violated ethical and professional standards of journalism; and finally the deeply false

portrayal of the women and the fictional “victim” narrative in your articles. In a subsequent letter, I will provide more detail in the ways in which the articles distort my own story with the women and will provide documentation of your reporter’s unprofessional and unethical conduct in reporting these pieces, contained in the hundreds of pages of my correspondence with her.⁴ This material, which I am at work compiling, will surely be of interest to *New York*’s masthead, as well as to the magazine’s parent company as they decide whether they want their brands associated with this journalistic witch trial.

The articles were right about exactly one thing: I am gullible. For the past two years, I put my trust in lawyers who I thought were representing my interests, and in your reporter, who I thought was in search of the truth about these women and my relationship with them. Having gradually gained distance from the lawyers and especially your reporter in the past six months, I have come to see how badly I have been deceived and exploited. The real story here is not the fictional tale in your articles, rather the real story is how this fictional tale came to be constructed about these women and published as fact in your magazine.

This story is not just about the injustice your magazine has inflicted on two people, it is a case study in some of the most pressing issues dominating the national conversation in this unprecedented moment. It is a story about the ways in which systemic racism, xenophobia, transphobia and misogyny are deployed to oppress and marginalize vulnerable people. It is a story about the pathologies afflicting law enforcement and our legal system that are weaponized against people of color and trans people. It is a story about the failure of journalism and the media to confront these issues openly and honestly and report them responsibly rather than treat them as occasions for creating salacious clickbait.

We watch in horror daily at white people who abuse law enforcement to scare and frighten people of color for “being in their way”: for birdwatching, for dating a family member against their wishes, for being “uppity” and “difficult”. Your magazine has long been known for exposing injustices of this nature and calling them by their true name. Yet with these articles, your magazine has enabled and participated in the very forms of injustice that it has been its mission to fight against. The magazine has deployed and fomented the bias and prejudice against those outside the norm, to destroy the life and family of a transgender mother of color whose only “crime” has been to upset cis white people. Especially ones who are wealthy and male.

I. MY APPROACH, AND YOUR RESPONSE

In my April 23 letter and followup email of May 7, I stated that I could no longer stand by the account attributed to me in the lead article; that the articles were filled with misrepresentations and put Maria-Pia & Mischa in a profoundly false light; that the reporting of the story had been thoroughly unprofessional; and that the results were surely causing

⁴ In the present letter I cite a small sample of the correspondence that will be attached to the subsequent letter.

devastating harm to the women and their loved ones. I made clear that the articles fall far short of the standard of any serious journalistic outfit, let alone a publication with the distinguished history and outstanding reputation that *New York* enjoys.⁵

The same is true, I am sorry to say, of the response my communications have received.

1. As I have said, your immediate reaction to my letter, which I designated off-record, was to disclose it to two people who have nothing to do with my retraction and our correspondence: Doug Brooks, my counsel in civil litigation against the women; and Howard Cooper, Jay Scuteri's counsel in civil litigation against the women. This is unethical and unprofessional.

2. You called Brooks with the slanderous assertion that I had written under pressure or in exchange for something. (That is something I denied in the letter itself, and I deny it again here. No one asked me to contact *New York* about the articles; no one offered me anything, or put any pressure on me; I have not asked for, and will not accept, anything in return.)⁶ You called Cooper with the equally slanderous assertion that I had acted under the women's "spell," not of my own accord. This is unethical and unprofessional.

3. The obvious purpose of these calls was to get these lawyers, with whom I have worked in the civil cases against the women, to use their influence to get me to withdraw my letter. This is unethical and unprofessional.

4. Your calls constitute interference in the matters that your reporter has been covering. As you know, Cooper and his client Jay Scuteri are in active litigation against the women. You effectively intervened in that dispute, making yourself and your client, *New York*, a participant in it. This is unethical and unprofessional.

5. You told Brooks that the articles would never be taken down, regardless of the very serious concerns that I had raised about them and your reporter, and threatened that my retraction letter would merely invite a third damaging article if I pursued the matter. The obvious import of this statement was that my attempt to correct the record and report journalistic misconduct would be futile and that I would face retaliation from a powerful, national media entity if I persisted. I must say, it seems to me that intimidating a source in this way is antithetical to everything *New York* stands for; and to do so in a case involving an article that has

⁵ In my April 23 letter, I retracted my story and withdrew all participation in the articles and in any reporting whatsoever by Kera Bolonik, including but not limited to any use of information or documents or interviews obtained from me, and I demanded that the articles be taken down immediately. As should be evident, I still take the position set forth in that letter, which I hereby repeat and renew.

⁶ The same is true of my decision to drop my lawsuit against Maria-Pia and Mischa, which I did last month. No one asked me to do it, no one offered me anything to do it; the decision was not part of any settlement or exchange; I have not received or been promised anything, and will not accept anything in return.

ruined subjects' lives is beyond the pale. But that is what your actions amount to. This is unethical and unprofessional.

6. In your email of May 12, you renewed the threat, stating ominously that you reserved the right to publish my off-record communications with you. Please note: I was the principal source for your articles, both of which feature me as the hook. As you well know, I shared an enormous amount of information with your reporter on the understanding that it would not be shared without my express permission. I find it simply extraordinary that you would attempt to intimidate a source into silence by threatening to break such an agreement. I will add that *New York* has rightly expressed outrage at the Trump administration's treatment of whistleblowers. I cannot believe the magazine would countenance strong-arming a source who comes forward with evidence of one its reporters' misconduct. But again, that is what your actions amount to. This is unethical and unprofessional.

7. In your email of May 12, you questioned my credibility without giving an explanation. In addition, you defended your reporter's work without seeking the details or supporting evidence for my objections to it. In so doing, you once again effectively dismissed without investigation the very serious concerns I had raised, and further underscored your message that *New York* wishes to silence and discredit individuals who come forward with damaging information about the accuracy of its articles or the performance of its reporters. This is unethical and unprofessional.

8. In saying you "respect [your reporter's] past and current work," you failed to acknowledge that she has no experience as a reporter, much less an investigative reporter equipped to handle such a complex and sensitive story. It seems to me that given her lack of qualifications, the magazine's decision to assign her this story amounted to journalistic malpractice. This was compounded by the magazine's failure to review her work more closely before it was published, and is now being further exacerbated by the refusal to take seriously the objections I have raised about the articles and your reporter (aside from the concerns I raise about her journalistic misconduct, I find it alarming that this individual so unqualified and inexperienced as a reporter, has secured a contract to publish a book on a subject whose complexity requires considerable expertise in investigative journalism). Your letter displays complete indifference to these problems and the serious harm that has resulted. This is unethical and unprofessional.

In her correspondence with me last fall, your reporter used offensive language to disparage Harper Collins's legal team for their response to complaints about her work being raised by Schillings, counsel to Maria-Pia and Mischa. The publishing house's lawyers, in her opinion, were being entirely too cautious and deliberative in evaluating the complaints. In short, they were being too professional. In retrospect, I now wish very fervently that such caution and deliberation had been exercised on behalf of *New York*. If they had been, these articles never would have seen the light of day and a great deal of gratuitous harm and undeserved suffering would have been avoided.

II. GENESIS OF THE ARTICLES

A. The Weird Sisters

When I was with them, Maria-Pia and Mischa used to say they were “soul sisters.” If I had had any idea of what was coming, I would have proposed they adopt the moniker Weird Sisters instead.⁷ That would have better captured their defiant refusal to conform to gender expectations, the virulent prejudice directed at them on that account, and the way they would be put on trial and punished for it.

Mischa, a trans woman of color, makes people uncomfortable. People used to glare at her when I took her to restaurants; Harvard campus police would hassle her and ask her for ID when they were asking no one else, and would order her off campus if she could not produce it;⁸ at playgrounds, children’s parents would direct nervous glances at her and her children. Liberally-inclined acquaintances complimented me for being so “openly” affectionate toward Mischa, as if it were an act I was putting on or some form of brave charity. No one has ever been able to quite believe that this woman could be loved by, and attractive to, a “normal” man, or that she could be a “real” mother to her children.⁹

Maria-Pia, a woman who flouts sexual mores, makes people uncomfortable. She approaches strangers in public, and sometimes “hits on” them; this is unremarkable for a man when a man does it, but a sign of trouble when a woman does it. She sometimes has multiple “hookups” in a short period of time; she can be deceptive and manipulative toward sex partners; she does not always answer honestly when asked about sexual activities with others or details of her personal life. All OK when done by a man, but ominous and disturbing — *What is she really after?* — when done by a woman.¹⁰

The women’s relationship, which flouts conventional expectations about family structure, makes people uncomfortable. They are legally married to each other, but not a couple. Mischa’s

⁷ This is what the witches in *Macbeth* are called.

⁸ I personally witnessed this on one occasion, and urged her to file a complaint.

⁹ I would describe our own relationship as one of platonic romantic love. As *maman* to the children, she was the one mostly responsible for their upbringing, and was as attentive, caring, and capable as any mother (or parent) I have ever seen.

¹⁰ As I explain below, this side of her life was something the women kept from me during our relationship, which I believe became monogamous after the pregnancy began and remained so until we split. I wish they had been more open about it. Maria-Pia’s sex life before our relationship was her business, but her deceptiveness toward me about it — she told me she had not been with another man in a long time — came at a heavy price for everyone. When I found out it was a lie, I started to question everything about our relationship, and began drawing the worst possible conclusions about what she and Mischa had been up to.

husband¹¹ is Andrew Klein, who lives with them. Maria-Pia has romantic involvements with women as well as men. Mischa is the three children's mother; Andrew is their father; Maria-Pia is something like their aunt. When I was in the picture, I was in love with both women, and something like an uncle to the children. This is all very weird and troubling.

What really makes people uncomfortable, though, is the women's defiant refusal to be ashamed about any of this. They are uncompromising feminists and trans activists, and adhere to the old feminist slogan that the personal is political. Rather than submit to personal mistreatment or social injustice, they fight back. This was something they often talked about when I knew them. It is, I now realize, what has led to all the conflicts and police reports and legal proceedings over the years that are now being held up as evidence of their depravity. Here are two examples, central to the story:

First example: During my relationship with them the women felt, justifiably, that they were being treated as mistresses. I had drawn Maria-Pia into the relationship with the assurance that Jennifer would tolerate our romance, and then strung her (and later Mischa) along with assurances that I would put an end to Jennifer's incessant attempts to sink it. I and Jennifer were lord and lady of the manor; they, the mistresses, were unwelcome at my house and had to remain out of sight. Their refusal to accept this demeaning role led to heated exchanges, angry confrontations with Jennifer, and ultimately the standoff over the house.

None of this had anything to do with severing me from my family, or getting hold of my money. It was about being treated with dignity. But to those inclined to see these women as sinister, and to see the worst in everything they do, this episode provides plenty of material. It is easily converted into a juicy *Fatal Attraction*-style thriller in which the scheming "abnormal" women seduce the hapless man, target him for fraud and extortion, and attempt to break up his happy all-American "normal" family. Such an account is pure fiction, and is flatly contradicted by the roughly 2000 pages of text message communications between me and the women. But it sells easily, because it confirms so many people's prejudices about women like this.

Second example: Maria-Pia apparently told three other men,¹² deceptively in some cases, that her "hook ups" with them in the spring of 2015 had made her pregnant. She did not ask any of them for money, and they did not give her any.¹³ I believe these acts of deception on her part, assuming that is a correct description, were Maria-Pia's way of fighting back against men who

¹¹ Mischa and Andrew consider themselves wife and husband, though they are not legally married.

¹² I am referring to Jay Scuteri (referred to as John Doe in the lead article) and Richard Roe of the lead article, and Anthony of the followup article.

¹³ Anthony has confirmed this about himself in communications with me. Scuteri's lawyer Howard Cooper, and Roe's lawyer Doug Brooks, also confirmed it to me about their respective clients.

think of women as disposable sex toys.¹⁴ What Maria-Pia was doing, I think, was disabusing these men of the idea that they could have a sexual encounter with a woman and then forget about her, making any resulting pregnancy *her* problem alone. This led to conflict-ridden communications with two of the men,¹⁵ who went to lawyers and, as I will explain below, touched off the conflagration that led to the articles.

It is quite clear that this had nothing to do with getting money from the men; to repeat, Maria-Pia did not ask a single one of them for a dime, none of them paid her a dime, and none of the men has ever said otherwise. But once again, for those inclined to see the worst in these women and everything they do, it is easy to portray this as a scheme of serial “fraud and

¹⁴ When I knew them, Maria-Pia and Mischa often railed against the “sexual marketplace,” in which some men considered themselves entitled to be “consumers” of women without worrying about the consequences. They also told me that they both engaged in unusual forms of activism against sexual violence and exploitation, without giving me the details. I believe Maria-Pia’s conduct in contacting the men was one such form of activism on her part, designed to remind the men that pregnancy is not something that only *women* should have to worry about, and — more generally — to impress upon them the radical idea that women are not commodities to be used, thrown away, and forgotten if any complication arises.

To explain: the three of us talked about gender politics all the time, at great length; one of the reasons they valued me was that I shared their commitment to feminism as well as their interest in its theory and practice; I valued them for the same reason, learned a great deal from them, and came to see the world through a very different lens as a result of being close to them. In numerous conversations on the subject, they used to regale me with their thoughts about and experiences of male entitlement. They had worked out an elaborate theoretical apparatus on the subject, including the typology of male sexual entitlement below, which they would often articulate in endless depth:

- Moral Majority types who tout “family values” and denounce extramarital sex while holding forth on the sanctity of life, who then pressure their secret mistresses and casual hook-ups into having abortions.
- “Gentleman” types who hold the women they marry to strict standards of purity and propriety, while acting out degrading pornographic fantasies with the “loose” women they use for recreational sex.
- Powerful “progressive” men who say all the right things about feminism, but who take advantage of their positions to exert sexual pressure on women under their authority in workplaces or universities.
- Men who enthusiastically cheat on their partners with other women, who become angry and aggressive when a complication such as an unexpected pregnancy arises and — often enabled by their girlfriends or wives and assisted by their wealth and influence — do all they can to make the women go away.
- “Woke” men who claim to be in favor of sexual liberation and denounce the objectification of women, who nonetheless behave in violent and degrading ways toward women in the bedroom, and who — when faced with an unexpected pregnancy — engage in slut-shaming, blame the women, and abandon all pretense of living by the values that they profess to hold.
- Men, conservative or liberal, who are willing to sexually consume trans women and exploit and objectify them, while being ashamed of any public or visible connection with them and projecting their own rage and shame onto the trans women themselves.

Pregnancy is a sort of flashpoint in many of these cases, exposing the hypocrisies and privileges of male power. Facades are harder to maintain if a woman refuses to slink away in silence and deal with the pregnancy on her own, leaving the man free to carry on as before, and instead expect the men to deal with the consequences of their actions.

Maria-Pia and Mischa and their lawyers have not quite admitted that Maria-Pia’s conduct was not just a “courtesy” to the men she had hooked up with, but was also a form of activism against male power. I myself am convinced that it was. It is the only explanation that makes sense to me, given what I know about their belief in personal and political “defiance.”

¹⁵ Roe engaged Doug Brooks in June 2015, after heated exchanges in which Maria-Pia urged him to consult a lawyer. Scuteri engaged Howard Cooper sometime in early 2016. Maria-Pia and Anthony apparently resolved the matter without the involvement of lawyers.

extortion" — without even *asking the question* whether money was sought from the men. That is what lawyers arrayed against the women have done; it is what I myself did, following the the lawyers' lead; and it is what your magazine has done.¹⁶

These are the Weird Sisters. To understand what has been done to them, it is helpful to recall the following facts:

- Many people's perceptions of individuals like these women are distorted by explicit or implicit biases — against trans women, against people of color, against women who are "too" sexually active, against unconventional families, against women who refuse to be quiet or submissive.
- Many people are quick to assume the worst about individuals like these women. As with Jews in the eyes of antisemites, minor or innocuous incidents are taken as proof of sinister activities. A convincing "case" can be built against them on the basis of lies or half-truths that would never be accepted if used against others.
- Conflict, trouble, and negative stories play an outsized role in the lives of individuals like these women — which, in many people's eyes, is proof of their perfidy. The conflicts they get embroiled in are their fault, not the fault of the others involved. *They*, and not the prejudice of others, are the cause of the trouble surrounding them. Negative stories about them accumulate like a snowball, which means they must be true.
- Law enforcement is easily weaponized against individuals like these women, whose actions are easily couched in the language of crime.
- The terms "trans woman" and "predator" are almost interchangeable for many people. Any narrative in which these two women are portrayed as predators will find acceptance all too quickly, with or without supporting evidence.
- Calling individuals like these two women witches, and accusing them of casting spells on men, is as old as the trees. We moderns have replaced the term "witches" with *deviant*, and the term "casting spells" with *brainwashing*, but the signification is the same.

B. The Klein Family's Attacks

Andrew became involved with Mischa in 2010, and has lived with her and Maria-Pia since 2011. At the beginning of their relationship, Andrew struggled to disclose the fact that he was in a relationship with a transgender woman to his family and friends. When he did finally

¹⁶ Your articles plainly imply that these men were victims of such a scheme, without telling the reader that none was asked for money, and that none has ever said otherwise.

tell them in 2011, he encountered violent opposition to the relationship, particularly from his father, William, and his sister, Margaret. I will go into a bit of detail about this, both because it shaped the events leading up to the article and because Margaret has become your reporter's close friend and principal source.¹⁷

Andrew's family were determined to break up his relationship with Mischa by essentially any means necessary. When efforts to persuade him failed, they moved on to other, less scrupulous methods. Margaret, by her own admission, staged an incident to make it appear that Mischa was harassing her.¹⁸ To "free" Andrew from the women, who "had a strange hold on Andrew, as if they were brainwashing him,"¹⁹ she and William lured him up to Margaret's New Hampshire apartment under some pretense; once he arrived, they snatched his phone, locked him in the apartment, and released him only on the condition that he stop seeing Mischa. Not surprisingly, this was unacceptable to the women as well as to Andrew, who broke contact with his father and sister.

Andrew's parents then turned to a friend on the Massachusetts state police force, who traveled to Cambridge to speak to Andrew. Andrew was away that weekend, so the trooper arranged to have Maria-Pia and Mischa called to the Cambridge police station, where the trooper asked intrusive questions — notably, about Mischa's family history and her ethnic origin — in an effort to intimidate and extract information from them. State troopers continued to call Andrew, prompting him to hire a lawyer to issue a cease-and-desist letter, to which the state trooper replied that he would leave Andrew alone if the lawyer met with Andrew without Mischa present to confirm he was aware of Mischa's dead name.²⁰ The officer's transparent purpose was to deploy Islamophobia in order to deter Andrew from associating with Mischa. In this way, a white family exploited the state police apparatus against a trans woman of color, knowing full well the intimidating effect it would have on her and the heightened dangers it would expose her to.²¹

¹⁷ My version of the story is drawn from drafts of an essay that Andrew asked me to read in 2017, and on numerous conversations I had with Andrew and Mischa in 2016 and 2017. I also rely on private investigator Bob Long's account of his interview with the Klein family, which is contained in Long's 5/18/18 report to Doug Brooks.

¹⁸ The trick involved turning on a recording device, and then pretending to receive a phone call from Mischa. The listener to the recording would hear Margaret responding to the abusive tirade Mischa was supposedly delivering from the other end of the conversation. Margaret played the recording for her mother Cynthia, apparently to convince Cynthia that she underestimated Mischa's awfulness.

¹⁹ I am quoting private investigator Bob Long's account of his interview with Andrew's father William, which is contained in Long's 5/18/18 report to Doug Brooks.

²⁰ Andrew confirmed to his lawyer that he was aware of Mischa's dead name — and was rightly offended by the xenophobic and racist implications of this inquiry, which was obviously motivated by the Arabic origins of Mischa's dead name.

²¹ As noted elsewhere, your publication has in fact called attention to the weaponization of law enforcement by white people against persons of color and marginalized people. It is therefore unfortunate that your reporter has not given more attention to the Klein family's victimization of Mischa in this regard.

The state police backed down; Andrew's family did not. William sent a barrage of transphobic messages to Andrew calling Mischa a "freak" who deserved to die.²² His father called the Cambridge police to report Andrew was having a nonexistent mental breakdown, urging them to compel Andrew to go to the hospital by ambulance for an evaluation. Unable to stop his family's meddling, Andrew eventually sought restraining orders against his parents.

The official lie circulated by Margaret and William became that the women had torn the family apart and estranged Andrew from his loved ones, when in fact — as he told me on a number of occasions — Andrew had long detested his father for, among other things, his violence toward Andrew's mother.²³ Margaret, meanwhile, spread wild rumors about Mischa and Maria-Pia among Andrew's circle of friends to try to isolate him from the women. They were snake worshippers, said Margaret, who forced Andrew to participate in strange satanic-tinged rituals.

Margaret developed an obsessive, unhinged hatred of Mischa. During the 2013 Boston Marathon bombing manhunt, it emerged on the news that the Tsarnaev brothers had a possible accomplice — Mikhail Allakhverdov, nicknamed Misha, who supposedly had converted them to a radical strain of Islam and "brainwashed" them into committing the crime. Upon seeing these news stories Margaret contacted the FBI, "reporting what she knew about the Mischa that was in Andrew's life, wondering if they [i.e., Misha and Mischa] were one and the same."²⁴ Let that sink in a moment: Margaret called the FBI to report that Mischa might be the suspect they were looking for in the investigation of the Boston marathon bombing. Given Mischa's ethnic background, this obscene action of Margaret's reveals a combination of racism, Islamophobia, transphobia and sheer malice toward Mischa that would sicken any fair-minded observer. If the FBI had taken her absurd identification at all seriously, Mischa could have been exposed to any number of grave dangers that many people of Middle Eastern backgrounds were being indiscriminately subjected to in post-Guantanamo America. Margaret's behavior could easily have landed Mischa on a no-fly list, on a terrorist-watch list, in arbitrary detention, or worse.²⁵

All of these actions left Andrew with no choice but to distance himself from these family members who were harassing and endangering his wife and children. Several years later, in 2016, Margaret and Cynthia made conciliatory overtures to Andrew and Mischa, apologizing for their past behavior, and attempting to reestablish ties. With characteristic generosity and

²² Andrew shared these text messages with me in 2017 as supporting material for the essay he was writing.

²³ This had been a recurring feature of Andrew's childhood, leading to a number of police incidents. Andrew later learned that his father had kicked Andrew's mother in the stomach during a pregnancy, causing her to miscarry.

²⁴ That Mischa bore absolutely no resemblance to the suspect, whose photograph was all over the news, seemingly had made no difference to Margaret. The incident is recounted by Margaret herself in the Long report of 5/18/18 (p. 9), from which the quoted language is drawn.

²⁵ This sheer lunacy has not prevented a lot of people, your reporter included, from accepting Margaret's view of Mischa. On the contrary, your reporter has befriended Margaret and has completely embraced her point of view, as we will see below.

kindness, Mischa forgave Margaret's years of basically unforgivable behavior, and agreed to open a new chapter.²⁶ This rapprochement lasted until May 2018, when Margaret was contacted by a private investigator sent by my own lawyer.²⁷ With no apparent hesitation, Margaret performed a quick about-face and resumed hostilities against the women. She rehashed for the investigator the same vitriolic lies she had been spreading five years earlier, and pointed him in the direction of others who would be willing to say damaging things about the women. Her loathing of Mischa was as thoroughly unhinged as ever, and remains so today.

Kera Bolonik connected with Margaret in early March 2019. She immediately told me Margaret was "lovely,"²⁸ and for the next year often spoke of the close friendship they had developed. Soon after their first conversation, Margaret agreed to start talking off-record about Mischa and Maria-Pia. In the spring and early summer of 2019, your reporter told me of several extensive off-record and confidential conversations with Margaret in which your reporter had acquired many negative stories about the women.²⁹ I believe your reporter gave the stories obtained from Margaret to your editors to help them overcome qualms they were having about publishing the article. Though Margaret's stories did not appear in the article, I believe they were instrumental to getting the article greenlighted, because they appeared to bear out the proposition that the women were villains.³⁰

²⁶ So much for the idea, peddled by the your reporter, and central to the lead article, that these women are in the business of breaking up families and estranging men from their loved ones.

²⁷ The investigator was Bob Long, discussed below.

²⁸ Email 3/3/19.

²⁹ This is one of many instances in which your reporter shared other sources confidential information with me.

³⁰ I find this deeply troubling for two main reasons.

First, the women were never given an opportunity to respond to the stories, neither for that matter was Andrew whose relationship with the women those stories were about. They were never made aware of the magazine's use of the stories and were given no chance to demonstrate that they were false and to demonstrate Margaret's complete lack of credibility as a source. This violates all notions of due process, and is a method calculated to undermine journalistic accuracy.

Second, since the article came out, your reporter has told me that Margaret is willing to go on record to corroborate the article's claims. This is highly deceptive to potential readers because it conceals the instrumental role that Margaret played in the publication of the lead article itself. She would misleadingly be presented as an independent corroborator to an article for which she has been a source. The "corroboration" is entirely spurious.

Let me add this: The role that she is playing in the article is parallel to the role she has played in the entire saga: as we will see below, the hateful things she was saying years ago about the women snowballed into the "serial predators" narrative later developed by lawyers, which was then embraced by your reporter and made the entire basis of the article. Having made Margaret her best friend and new principle source, your reporter is in effect using Margaret to "corroborate" the very slanders of the women that she herself uttered years ago that produced the reporter's narrative in the first place.

As I point out in part in three below, your reporter and Margaret have in effect joined forces to realize Margaret's long-simmering vengeful fantasies about punishing the women and reuniting Andrew with his wholesome family, fantasies that are shared by your reporter and suit her True Crime project perfectly.

C. Origins of the “Predator” Narrative

The paper trail behind your articles can be traced to two 2015 documentary sources: a report about the women written by private investigator Bob Long; and a letter by attorney Doug Brooks incorporating Long’s findings, which Brooks sent to the women on behalf of his client Richard Roe. They are shocking documents — not for what they reveal about the women, but for what they reveal about the raw bigotry animating the effort to make criminals out of them, as well as the corruption in the law enforcement machinery that has been used in service of that effort.

1. The 2015 Long Report

Roe retained Brooks in June 2015, following angry text message exchanges with Maria-Pia in which she urged him to consult a lawyer.³¹ Brooks engaged Long, a former state police trooper and longtime president of the Boston Police Foundation,³² to look into Maria-Pia’s private life. Long wrote a three-part report discussing what he had found out concerning Maria-Pia, Mischa, and Andrew.³³

The Long report builds up to the dramatic conclusion that the women were operating a “deviant scheme to extort money from young men for the purpose of financial gain.”³⁴ The report contains no evidence of this supposed scheme on the women’s part. What it *does* contain, however, is unambiguous evidence of Bob Long’s scheme to entrap and extort them.

The Long report oozes with xenophobia, transphobia, and misogyny. It repeatedly misgenders Mischa, referring to her as “he/she.” The report mocks an essay she had written on motherhood, calls undue attention to her ethnic background, and highlights her progressive political leanings. It calls Maria-Pia “a manipulating, calculating, pathological liar,” and makes clear the author is repelled by her sexual activities. It refers to Long’s conversation with Andrew’s father William, who described how “bizarre and unusual” Andrew’s behavior had become after he fell in with the women. The reports leave no doubt where Long’s sympathies lie — with this poor man whose formerly *normal* son has been carried off, and his *wholesome* family life destroyed, by this trans woman of color and her sexually profligate partner in crime.

³¹ Why a would-be extortionist would do this — urge her target to consult a lawyer — is a question that has only recently occurred to me. Like their failure to seek money from any of their supposed victims, it suggests that these women do not understand their supposed trade very well.

³² Long’s website is <https://www.boblongpi.com>. He was president of the Boston Police Foundation from 2012 to 2019.

³³ The report is contained in Long’s letters to Brooks dated 6/25/15, 7/9/15, and 7/21/15.

³⁴ Letter from Long to Brooks, 7/21/15.

This demonization of the women, and the weaponization of law enforcement against them, was simply a continuation of the campaign that Andrew's family members had launched against them in the preceding years. As we have seen, Andrew's parents in effect dispatched a state trooper friend against the women in 2011, knowing of and seeking to exploit the vulnerability they face as a result of their unconventional family arrangement and Mischa being a trans woman of color. That trooper made full use of whatever weapons lay at hand, including Mischa's ethnic background and family history, in order to intimidate the women and separate them from Andrew. Long, dispatched against the women in 2015, picked up where the state trooper left off. His report incorporated and validated the animosity of Andrew's family members toward the women; it built up and ratified the idea that the women had brainwashed Andrew into moving in with them; it gave ammunition to people seeking to harness transphobic, misogynistic, and xenophobic stereotypes against the women; and it created a destructive new narrative about the women, portraying them not only as "deviant" but as *criminals*.

The Long report provides a disturbing window onto the way in which its author has used corrupt and unscrupulous methods, with the participation of the Cambridge police, to "criminalize" these women — to gather private information about them, to intimidate and silence them, to isolate them from their friends, to extract money from them, and to set them up for criminal prosecution.

1. In interviewing people connected to Maria-Pia and Mischa, Long and his associates misleadingly said that he was working with law enforcement, giving the false impression that he was conducting a criminal investigation of the women. His obvious purpose was to put pressure on the interview subjects to divulge any dirt he might find useful. An equally obvious byproduct was to make these people worry that the women were possible criminal suspects, thereby damaging the women's relationship with friends, co-workers, and so on.

2. Using his connections at the Cambridge Police Department, he got police records on the women what were not publicly available — reports of perfectly legitimate complaints the women had made³⁵ — in order to cherry-pick them for snippets, taken out of context, to construct a misleading narrative about the women.

3. At Long's request, police officers were dispatched to seek records from Maria-Pia's stay at a bed & breakfast in Cambridge, "whose owners refused to cooperate based on a recent Supreme Court decision."³⁶ In other words Long had effectively commissioned an unlawful search and seizure to be carried out by the Cambridge police on behalf of his client.

³⁵ I discuss these below.

³⁶ Letter of 7/21/15.

4. Having failed to turn up any evidence of the “deviant scheme,” Long — along with two detectives and three commanding officers of CPD — met and drew up plans to run a sting operation against the women using Tinder, the dating app. Though the report did not spell this out, the sting operation would presumably have involved luring Maria-Pia into having sex with a man working for the police, and then waiting for her to claim she was pregnant and demand money from him.

In the conclusion to his report, Long recommended that Brooks approve the proposed sting operation, which if successful would make possible a case of extortion against the women, and would also make possible a lawsuit with which to extract money from them. Long told Brooks that the sting operation had the enthusiastic support of his friends in law enforcement, assuring him that “the police would be more than glad to cooperate with us and investigate the matter further if [Maria-Pia] makes an overt act with respect to any extortion attempt.”³⁷ Finally, he noted that his research had revealed that the women appeared to have significant financial resources, which would make a lawsuit against them a rewarding method of exerting pressure on them. In other words: unable to find any evidence that the women had extorted Roe or anybody else, the private investigator effectively proposed enabling Roe to extort money from *them*.

Ordinarily, this whole episode would be the subject of a *New York* exposé of corruption at the top. Just look at the story: By hiring the president of the Boston Police Foundation, a wealthy and powerful white man³⁸ essentially purchases law enforcement’s help to intimidate and shake down two women for the “crime” of upsetting his son; the engagement results in a misogynistic, transphobic report revealing the investigator’s bigotry and the police’s willingness to employ unlawful methods at his request; the police provide him with nonpublic information about the women, agree to conduct an unlawful search and seizure to obtain evidence against them, and help draw up a sting operation approved by top brass at police headquarters; the sting operation would entrap the women into committing an act of extortion they had never committed before; the evidence would then be turned over to the wealthy client, who could then use it to extort *the women*.

That is the sort of grotesque misuse of police power that the magazine would normally make its target. But not this time around. Rather than side against this corrupt machine and its persecution of two vulnerable women, *New York* sided with it. As we will see, the Long report is the root of the poisonous tree of which the magazine’s articles about the women are the fruit.

³⁷ Letter of 7/21/15.

³⁸ I should note that Poe, Roe and Scuteri are all from very wealthy, well-connected families. They are all the sons of powerful white men who hired private investigators to follow these women around and dig in to their private lives once their twentysomething sons became upset with Maria-Pia. Though the PI surveillance revealed nothing incriminating about the women, pricey Boston lawyers were nevertheless dispatched by the fathers to intimidate, shake down and silence the women.

2. The Brooks Letter

Brooks, apparently convinced by his PI, wrote a letter to Maria-Pia on behalf of Roe in which he accused her of engaging in a series of “schemes aimed at extorting money from men whom you have falsely claimed impregnated you.”³⁹ He gave the following instances:

- He recounted the story of John Poe that eventually made it into lead *New York* article. He stated that Maria-Pia and Mischa had “extorted” Poe, and then — when he tried to break free of their grasp — had brought an abusive restraining order proceeding in which they made “blatantly false” accusations that he had raped Maria-Pia and threatened her life.
- He claimed that Andrew had tried to leave the women in 2011, and that they had “enticed him back by falsely claiming that you had cancer and that you were pregnant with his child.”
- He recounted an incident in involving a man whom Maria-Pia had met on Tinder and had considered “hooking up” with. In a text exchange with the man, Maria-Pia had told the man that he would not need to use a condom, because she “couldn’t get pregnant.”
- He stated that she had said Roe had made her pregnant; that it was “unlikely” she was telling the truth; and that this was another one of the “schemes” in question.

The Letter’s Deceptiveness. The letter gave the impression that there was evidence supporting its inflammatory “extortion scheme” charges, without disclosing what it was. In truth, there was essentially no evidence at all. Let us look at each instance Brooks gave.

1. Poe

a. For the Poe story, Brooks simply appropriated, and presented as established fact, Poe’s testimony at a 2014 proceeding in which Maria-Pia had unsuccessfully sought a restraining order against him. The letter did not disclose that Brooks was ventriloquizing Poe in this way. It also did not disclose that Maria-Pia was unrepresented at the proceeding; that Poe was not cross-examined; and that the judge had been essentially silent at the hearing, and gave no reasons for his ruling.

b. At the hearing, Poe testified he had paid \$11,000 to Maria-Pia via her friend Jacqueline Lescarret. What Poe did *not* say was that some time earlier Maria-Pia

³⁹ Brooks letter of August 6, 2015 to Maria-Pia.

had given him at least \$10,000, as a third party bank subpoena shows.⁴⁰ So much for the “extortion” charge.

c. Brooks’s assertion that the women’s accusations against Poe were “blatantly false” — or false at all — came out of thin air. The judge had made no finding about the accusations, and expressed no view about them from the bench.⁴¹ He had denied the request for a restraining order, without explanation, after it emerged that Poe had not seen Maria-Pia in several years and had not spoken to her in nearly a year. For all anyone knows, the judge *credited* the women’s accusations, but decided they did not warrant issuance of a restraining order.

2. Andrew

a. Brooks did not disclose that his source was Andrew’s father William Klein, who apparently did not believe that Maria-Pia had cancer and that Andrew had caused her first pregnancy.⁴² William gave no reason for his belief, and Brooks gave no reason for supposing it was true. The letter simply presented, unattributed, William’s opinion as established fact.

b. By its own terms, this was a story about getting Andrew back into a relationship that became permanent. What did this have to do with extortion?

3. Tinder

Brooks had no evidence that Maria-Pia was planning to ask this man for money.

⁴⁰ This has emerged through a third-party subpoena in civil litigation.

⁴¹ The focus of the hearing was on Mischa’s testimony that in a conversation the previous week, Poe had told Mischa that he wanted to kill Maria-Pia. Maria-Pia testified that Poe had sexually assaulted her five years earlier; this got essentially no attention in the hearing, either from the judge or Poe’s counsel.

⁴² Bob Long’s report of July 21, 2015, on which Brooks relied, stated the following (p. 2): “Mr. Klein had become concerned over his son’s bizarre and unusual behavior since he became involved with Shuman. At one point, Andrew moved out on Shuman, but she soon enticed him back after claiming she was sick with cancer and was pregnant with his child.”

Brooks also neglected to mention that the Tinder communication had come to light because the man on Tinder had begun harassing and threatening Maria-Pia, leading her to contact the police.⁴³

4. Roe

Brooks omitted the fact that Maria-Pia had not asked Roe for any money.

Impact of the Brooks Letter. On inspection, then, Brooks's tale about "schemes aimed at extorting money from men whom you have falsely claimed impregnated you" was smoke and mirrors. Its transparent purpose was to scare off the women with the possibility that they would face serious felony charges if they did not leave his client alone. Shortly after sending this letter, Brooks negotiated an agreement with Maria-Pia's lawyer in which Roe and Maria-Pia promised to have no further contact.⁴⁴ Matters might have rested there if events had not led me to Brooks three years later, at which point I saw the letter and accepted it at face value, not realizing how deceptive it was.

C. My Embrace of the "Predator" Narrative

Sequence of Events. My own relationship with the women came to a sudden, acrimonious end in August 2017, when we found ourselves in court during the standoff over the house. There were police episodes and restraining order hearings, after which my lawyers insisted that I change my phone number and break contact with Maria-Pia and Mischa. I finally did so, for good, on August 23, 2017. I was left feeling angry, betrayed, and very alone.

Jennifer, unsurprisingly, had long told me that the women were up to no good with me. In the wake of the August 2017 rupture, she claimed to be vindicated. She said that the house standoff had proved the women were "grifters," as she called them. They had lied about the baby's paternity; they had manipulated me with tales about Maria-Pia's nonexistent cancer; the whole relationship had been one big scam. So she said.

⁴³ The subsequent omission of this account by those seeking to demonize Maria-Pia and Mischa can hardly be an accident. According to the police reports on the matter, the police credited and acted on Maria-Pia's allegations of threats and harassment by the unnamed Tinder man because they were supported by text messages he had sent.

I need to make a more general point about the Brooks letter's claim about "blatantly false accusations," which took on a life of its own later, and eventually made its way into Kera Bolonik's reporting. His investigator Long found three police episodes involving Maria-Pia: Poe; the unnamed Tinder man; and a man named Benji, whom she had reported to the police for stalking and telephone harassment. Long's report makes evident that the police credited her complaint about Benji, which was supported by phone and text records.

It is notable that two of the three individuals Maria-Pia reported to the police undeniably harassed her, in the view of the police; Poe's situation is at best unclear. One would never know this from the lead article's claim that Maria-Pia has a history of filing false police reports.

⁴⁴ As I discuss below, Brooks insisted that Maria-Pia sign a nondisclosure agreement, which his own client did not sign. He has taken the position that he is free to talk about the matter.

I resisted this idea until October 2017, when I met Howard Cooper, counsel for Jay Scuteri (referred to as John Doe in the lead article).⁴⁵ Cooper told me the story about Scuteri that eventually made it into the lead article, and offered to represent me in litigation against the women. I gave far too much credence to Cooper, in part because I was blinded by feelings of sexual jealousy.⁴⁶ The women had told me that Scuteri had sexually assaulted Maria-Pia;⁴⁷ I believed them, and Cooper — who avoided the subject entirely — gave me no reason not to continue believing them.

Cooper made no secret of his intense dislike of the women and repeatedly told me they were dangerous women who sought to destroy men's lives. As with Brooks in the Roe episode, Cooper's reflex was to attempt to criminalize the women by taking the matter to law enforcement. Cooper, aiming higher than the Cambridge police, approached the Massachusetts Attorney General's office in December 2017 with information about me and Scuteri — an approach which I was easily talked into authorizing. In hindsight, it is surprising Cooper thought that these two minor matters would interest the Attorney General's office. He was clearly banking on the potentially sensational nature of the case, owing to the unconventional lives these women led. Unsurprisingly, Cooper's request for an investigation of the women was turned down.

The predator narrative was further reinforced for me in when I engaged Brooks in April 2018.⁴⁸ His 2015 letter, which he showed me at our first meeting, enraged me at the women — enraged me so much that I did not take the trouble to inspect the letter's evidentiary basis or the soundness of its reasoning. The letter itself, written by a reputable lawyer, was all the "ocular proof" I needed. Jennifer had been right all along. The women were predators, with a trail of victims. I filed my lawsuit against them in May 2018. The following month Brooks, like Cooper

⁴⁵ I contacted Cooper because the women had told me about their dispute with Scuteri.

⁴⁶ As our romance unfolded in the spring of 2015 and she became pregnant, Maria-Pia told me that I was the only man who could have caused the pregnancy. I now see her reasons for deceiving me: she wanted a relationship with me and feared, quite rightly, that I would make a quick exit if I knew that someone else might have caused the pregnancy. She and Mischa never disabused me afterward. In retrospect, I very much wish they had done so: it would have been painful to hear from them at the time, but that would have prevented the conflict that arose from my hearing about it from the lawyers later.

⁴⁷ Mischa had told me about the sexual assault in 2016 and both women told me about it in the summer of 2017.

⁴⁸ Cooper had decided it would be better if he did not represent both me and Scuteri, so I hired Doug Brooks based on the referral given by a friend. In fact, in 2015 Mischa had shown me the non-disclosure agreement prepared by Brooks in the Roe matter. I presumably saw Roe's and Brooks' name in the document when I was shown it in 2015, but did not register them and therefore had no memory that Brooks had been adverse to Maria-Pia and Mischa when I was referred to him in April 2018. The person who referred me to Brooks knew no identifying details of any of these matters.

before him, tried to interest the Attorney General's Office in launching a criminal investigation of the women. Once again, the Attorney General's Office sensibly declined.⁴⁹

Overlooked Problems. A detached observer, if I had consulted one, would have had a word for this whole narrative: idiotic. She would have pointed out two problems:

1. Evidence of the "trail of victims" was nonexistent.
 - a. There was no indication the women had "extorted" any of the other men. On the contrary, their behavior contradicted it: they had not asked Scuteri or Roe for any money.⁵⁰ In Roe's case, Maria-Pia urged him to seek counsel almost right away — hardly the act of an extortionist. As for Poe, we saw above the problems with Brooks's "extortion" and "blatantly false accusations" claims.
 - b. Scuteri was notably reluctant to actually sue the women for the terrible things Cooper was claiming they had done to his client.⁵¹ Perhaps he was afraid of the evidence that would emerge in support of Maria-Pia's rape accusation against him.⁵²
 - c. None of the men would talk. According to Brooks, his former client Roe was too "traumatized" to speak about what had happened to him; so, I was told, was Poe;⁵³ Cooper said the same thing about his client Scuteri. *Too traumatized to speak* — this was proof, of course, that the men had indeed been terribly victimized by the women. A detached observer would have pointed out that they might have other reasons for keeping quiet.

⁴⁹ Brooks's failed overture to the AG's office was the fifth time law enforcement authorities had considered and outright rejected the idea of launching an investigation of the women — the others being the Klein family's 2011 approach to the Massachusetts State Police; Margaret Klein's 2013 approach to the FBI; Bob Long's 2015 approach to the Cambridge police; and Howard Cooper's 2018 approach to the AG. Kera Bolonik was aware of all of these failed attempts to interest law enforcement in the women. These repeated failures would have been a red flag to any reasonably sensible professional journalist, a suggestion that the accusations being made against the women were not credible. Undeterred, Bolonik uncritically embraced the view that these women were criminals, and has hoped ever since to manufacture a case that will finally persuade the authorities to prosecute the women and make her True Crime dreams come true.

⁵⁰ This was confirmed by their respective lawyers, Brooks and Cooper.

⁵¹ He filed suit in July 2018, two months after I did. This was over two years after the March 2016 communications in which Cooper had threatened to sue and over three years after Scuteri's last communications with Maria-Pia.

⁵² That may also be why, now that he has won a default judgment, he shows no interest in proving his damages. A default judgment was entered in December. No hearing on damages has been scheduled.

⁵³ Brooks said he had reached out to Poe in July 2015, during his representation of Roe, and had been told Poe was psychologically unable to speak about the matter. I myself got essentially the same answer in April 2018, when I contacted the lawyer who had represented Poe in the 2014 restraining order proceeding.

2. Evidence of my own victimhood was also nonexistent.

a. On any fair-minded reading, the voluminous written correspondence between me and the women was the record of three people who loved each other and wound up hurting each other a great deal.

b. The women had deceived me about Maria-Pia's hookups with other men, but I had deceived them about my bond with Jennifer. The deceptions were wrong, but done out of a desire not to lose each other. They were my "victims" as much as I was theirs.

c. The proper venue for resolving our differences was something like divorce mediation. We needed family lawyers, not scorched-earth criminal lawyers like Brooks and Cooper.

My Mindset. Had I looked at the situation with a cool eye, I would have seen these problems. But I did not have a cool eye, or a clear head, for three reasons.

First, I was in bunker mentality. My legal dispute with the women was exploding; Harvard had suspended me; my life seemed to be falling apart. I was frightened and alone, speaking to essentially no one about the situation but Jennifer and the lawyers,

Second, I was in an echo chamber. Like Jennifer, the lawyers — particularly Cooper — had obvious motives to encourage me to think of myself as one of a number of victims.⁵⁴ I had an obvious motive to believe them, because the existence of other victims would strengthen my own position in court and at Harvard. In this echo chamber, the party line was that the other men and I were victims.

Third, I was frankly consumed by jealousy and feelings of sexual betrayal. I was Othello; Cooper was Iago; and the Brooks letter was the handkerchief. I did not know what I believed anymore, and was ready to believe the worst. I am furious at the way I was used and manipulated by Cooper in his attempt to extract money from the women on behalf of his client.⁵⁵

⁵⁴ Cooper's client Scuteri had much to gain from the pressure my own lawsuit exerted on the women, as well as from the prospect of my serving as a witness in his lawsuit.

⁵⁵ I contacted Cooper in the fall of 2017 with limited knowledge of the Scuteri matter. Cooper represented me for the next several months, and in the process obtained a substantial amount of information from me about the women and what they had shared with me about the Scuteri matter. When my litigation against the women erupted in the spring of 2018, Cooper declared he could no longer represent me citing a potential conflict, owing to his representation of Scuteri. Since this supposed conflict had been there all along, I can only conclude that he had not really wanted to represent me in civil litigation at all, and had taken the engagement primarily in order to obtain information from me for the benefit of his long-time client Scuteri. I also believe that Cooper's work with your reporter to trash the women and seek groundless criminal investigations of them is motivated by his desire to put a smoke screen over Maria-Pia's credible accusations that Scuteri raped her. I will say further that Cooper's aggressive litigation tactics against the women have been calculated to prevent an adjudication on the merits of the Scuteri case, which I believe he and his client are desperate to avoid because it would involve airing that accusation.

D. My Approach to Your Reporter

I contacted your reporter on June 24, 2018, told her my story, and sent her a long document I had just completed — my written submission for the Title IX matter pending at Harvard, in which I set forth my understanding from Brooks and Cooper about what had happened to the other men. The submission effectively called the Title IX complaint against me an act of extortion, which I thought to be true then but no longer believe.⁵⁶

Today, the submission reads as though it was written in captivity, from a cell with no windows, by a man who has lost all contact with reality. Its author begins by describing himself as a victim of a “protracted campaign of fraud, extortion, and false accusations,” and goes on to tell a story that certainly makes it *seem* that way. It is told with utter conviction, and appears to be supported by the documents that have been selectively quoted as evidence.⁵⁷ Did he really believe it? Was he trying to please his captors, whoever they were?

I have no idea. All I know is this: as an account of what really happened between me and the women, of how we felt about each other and what was motivating us, that man’s story is unrecognizable. If he thought he was telling *my* story, his captors had surely brainwashed him.

III. YOUR REPORTER’S CONDUCT

I approached your reporter in search of an investigative journalist who could get the truth out about these women. My purpose in contacting her was to get her advice, and possibly a referral; I did not think of her as an investigative reporter.⁵⁸ But when she proposed covering the story herself for *New York*, the idea seemed reasonable to me. Your reporter appeared to be sensitive to gender, LGBT, and racial issues, a quality that I considered important to getting the story right; she said she would do a thorough and conscientious job; if the editors at a reputable outfit such as *New York* trusted her to cover the story responsibly, so did I.

⁵⁶ Mischa’s Title IX complaint against me was neither an act of fraud and extortion nor an abuse of process. However, I no more sexually harassed Mischa than she and Maria-Pia extorted me. While I can not get into her thoughts, I can readily see how — in the heat of conflict — she could genuinely believe in charges against me that were not true and that she herself would not have believed under less stressful and adversarial circumstances. I can readily see this because I was led to believe in charges against her that were not true, as I myself would have recognized absent the fraught circumstances that kept me in an echo chamber.

⁵⁷ Any reasonably objective reader of the documentary evidence would have greeted this account with skepticism, if not outright incredulity, and would have cross-examined its author closely. None of that happened with your reporter, who merely amplified my fantastical perceptions of the situation, and preferred not to address the multiple obvious contradictions in the narrative.

⁵⁸ We were Facebook friends, came from the same hometown, and had an old friend in common. I had never communicated with her before, but frequently saw her posts on Facebook and could see that she had a lot of journalistic connections.

For the next eighteen months, we were in frequent, often daily, contact as she worked on the articles and then began work on her book. We became friends and collaborators. I had never worked with an investigative journalist before, and frequently told her I was relying on her to tell me the rules of the road and to make sure we abided by them. I trusted that she was doing a professional job. Only after our contacts became less frequent, starting around the New Year, did I begin to realize how thoroughly I had been defrauded and exploited.

No *professional* journalist — least of all one with the gender-LGBT-racial sensitivity I thought your reporter possessed — would have failed to turn a *very* skeptical eye toward this remarkable story I'd brought her about these "predators" and their "trail of victims." Such a journalist would have seen the evidentiary problems regarding the other men, the emptiness of the "extortion" charge, the reliance on innuendo. She would have seen how self-serving my own little tale of victimhood was, how contradicted it was by the voluminous correspondence I'd had with the women. She would have seen how the demonology surrounding these women was being fueled by prejudice, and how it was being exploited by lawyers who had a lot to gain from such a sensational case. In short, she would have seen a witch hunt in the making, and pushed back.

But this this project was never about journalism. It was about creating a "true-crime" narrative — which is how your reporter herself described the finished lead article⁵⁹ — that could be expanded into a book to rival her late friend Michelle McNamara's *I'll Be Gone in the Dark: My Obsessive Quest for the Golden State Killer*. She mentioned that book in our very first conversation, and many times afterward, with a combination of reverence and envy. Her late friend's book had helped catch a serial predator and put him in jail. Your reporter was going to match the feat.

I had given her the perfect characters. For True Crime, what could possibly match a salacious story about two man-hating, serial-victimizing, sexually deviant, overeducated Parisian women at Harvard — one of whom, for heaven's sake, is a *trans woman of color*? It was almost too good to be true. The opportunities for exploiting misogynistic and transphobic stereotypes, along with the narrative strategies of the slasher-film thriller, were endless. If she could get these women prosecuted, the calls from Hollywood would never stop pouring in.

From the start, your reporter was out to show that these women were waging a "campaign of fraud, extortion, and false accusations" against me and other men — words *I myself* had written in my Title IX submission days before meeting her, which she lifted and presented as fact in the lead article a year later.⁶⁰ Her work on the articles was one long exercise in building a case

⁵⁹ Email 7/26/19.

⁶⁰ That formulation appeared in the first paragraph of my personal statement in the Title IX proceeding against me, which I submitted on about June 20 and gave to your reporter when I contacted her on June 24. The lead article incorrectly attributes the words to my lawyer. They are in the opening paragraph of a document that explicitly names me as the author.

to that effect, and in helping others do the same, with no regard for the boundaries that normally separate a reporter from her sources and story. Thus, she overcame Jennifer's reluctance to talk to her by assuring that she hoped to "help bring the two to justice."⁶¹ She spoke glowingly of Brooks and Cooper, rejoiced at every favorable development in the litigation against the women,⁶² steered sources their way to serve as witnesses,⁶³ and urged sources to hire them to bring cases of their own against the women.⁶⁴ She rooted for me in the conflict at Harvard, and suggested materials to submit and arguments to make in my defense.⁶⁵ She repeatedly proposed telling the Title IX investigator about the women's work with other journalists, urging me to say it constituted impermissible harassment or retaliation on Mischa's part.⁶⁶ She supported efforts to interest the police in the women, and was disappointed when the efforts failed.⁶⁷

Precautions to ensure the integrity of the reporting process were ignored. Your reporter repeatedly shared the off-record confidences of other sources.⁶⁸ She told her sources what other sources were saying, contaminating purportedly independent accounts.⁶⁹ She asked me and Jennifer to help her evaluate the reliability of accounts of other sources.⁷⁰ She asked me for my interpretation of evidence and for my legal assessments; I was simultaneously her subject, source, fact-checker, editor, and legal consultant.⁷¹ She incessantly shared her own opinions on the people she was writing about, on the sources she was speaking to, and on the stories she was hearing.

For your reporter, sources are instrumentalities for building her preferred narrative. I cannot count the number of occasions she pushed me to see the women in the worst possible light, as when — to take a single example — in response to my wondering aloud why Maria-Pia

⁶¹ Email 8/9/18.

⁶² Text message 12/11/19.

⁶³ Text message 8/27/19 ("The good news is that [Anthony] got in touch and I put him in touch with HC").

⁶⁴ Text message 9/10/19.

⁶⁵ Email 7/26/18; email 8/23/18; email 12/6/18; text message 12/20/18; email 11/7/19.

⁶⁶ Email 1/18/19; text message 8/8/19; email 8/10/19; text messages 8/14/19.

⁶⁷ Email 11/14/18; email 12/6/18; email 12/11/18.

⁶⁸ To give one example of many, source AM — an Olympic athlete — approached her in strict confidence, as she told me on numerous occasions. Text message 8/27/19 ("I wish I could put you in touch w swimmer dude earlier but I worry about him ghosting me"). She told me the details of his account, including very intimate ones, along with enough identifying information that I easily guessed his identity.

⁶⁹ For example, she repeatedly made clear she was shopping accounts back and forth between me and sources connected to Andrew and also among men who approached her after the lead article came out.

⁷⁰ For example, she used us to evaluate the stories of all of the individuals described in the followup article.

⁷¹ Email 8/24/19 ("it's a good think I know a civ pro prof to consult!").

had first approached me, she answered simply: "She is a predator."⁷² She did not care about challenging the sources who gave her stories that suited her; for example, she never confronted Scuteri (referred to as John Doe in the lead article) on the subject of Maria-Pia's credible accusations of sexual assault against him. Your reporter chased sources who offered material with which to trash the women, while showing no interest in speaking to sources who might say something favorable about the women or complicate the narrative.⁷³ Sources who supported the narrative were reliable, no matter how suspect their accounts or how little evidence they provided.⁷⁴ The more extreme the account of the women's perfidy, the better. A source who spouts anonymous online vitriol about the women was a "good person" because she is a friend of Andrew's sister Margaret;⁷⁵ a source who resisted your reporter's effort to cast him as a victim is thereby untrustworthy, and must be taking orders from the women.⁷⁶

The project has been governed by the conspiracist's mode of reasoning. Any testimony against the women, no matter how far-fetched or dubiously sourced, is proof of their villainy. Any testimony in the women's *favor*, by contrast, is not only automatically suspect; it actually *confirms* their villainy by demonstrating the power they have over what others think and say. Searching out and speaking to people with a favorable opinion of the women would have served no purpose; it would only have demonstrated how successfully the women disguised themselves to such people. Likewise, Andrew's apparently happy relationship with the women, now in its tenth year, reveals how completely they take possession of men's minds. The occasional

⁷² Email 3/3/19.

⁷³ I repeatedly reminded her to contact source SA, one of the few relatives Mischa had talked about being in touch with when I knew her. Your reporter somehow never found the time.

⁷⁴ She often told me that she considered a certain source MS to be very dishonest, but continued working with him as he fed her damaging "information" about the women. She broke contact only when he started asking her too many questions, which suggested to her that he was using her for ulterior purposes.

⁷⁵ Text message 8/8/19.

⁷⁶ Here I must recount the example of Joshua Holt, who approached us after the lead article appeared. (Email 7/28/19.) He sent your reporter 50 pages of intimate text correspondence between himself and Maria-Pia from the time of their relationship, which she immediately forwarded to me to evaluate. (Email 9/10/19.) For the next few months, she frequently divulged to me and Jennifer his confidential off-record communications with your reporter. She was pushing him to see himself as a scam victim and to file a lawsuit against Maria-Pia, preferably with Cooper or Brooks, and sought our input on this. (Text message 9/10/19.)

When Holt complained to *New York* about your reporter's conduct, she immediately turned against him, and declared to me that he was in fact an impostor working on Mischa and Maria-Pia's behalf. That idea is contradicted by two facts: (1) The 50 pages of correspondence were unquestionably authentic, and could only have come from the man who had indeed been corresponding with Maria-Pia at the time he dated her; and (2) he had no idea who was currently representing the women, instead relying on my own out-of-date information to falsely claim that he had interacted with their lawyer.

Until Holt's "defection" she had told me his story was going to figure prominently in her book, as evidence of Maria-Pia's desire for a "normal" (Mischa-free) relationship. As soon as he complained about her sharing his off-record confidential communications and efforts to distort his story, she declared that he was a fraud.

objections I voiced to your reporter about her dark picture of the women showed that they still had a hold on me.⁷⁷

Your reporter never got the women's side of the story, because she did not want to. Following an off-record phone call with Mischa in October 2018, she told me that she had no desire to speak to her again. She had not believed a word Mischa had said, making further further communication pointless. Mischa, she said later, was "quite the performer" who had "delivered a late-era Streep" in the conversation.⁷⁸ Of course, she provided no explanation or basis for these extreme and offensive statements about another source. After the articles came out, she gloated that no reporter or publication would help them tell their side of the story, because "everybody knows they are liars and grifters."⁷⁹

This is not just business for your reporter; it is personal. She has never hidden her disdain for these "truly awful" women.⁸⁰ She is openly envious of their intelligence and academic achievements, which she denigrates with groundless conjectures that they are not real. Thus, has Maria-Pia is not "smart" enough to have the physics degree she earned,⁸¹ and Mischa may not really be enrolled at Harvard at all.⁸² Of course, the evidence shows that Maria-Pia does in fact have a physics degree and Mischa is in fact enrolled at Harvard. The women have "delusions of grandeur,"⁸³ which are being punctured now that your reporter has exposed them for the frauds that they are: "They believe they're smarter than everyone and gave themselves the highest challenge by preying on people in the intellectual epicenter of the country. They thought they could outsmart everybody. And that is the painful truth that they are having to face right now."⁸⁴

Your reporter's antipathy toward Mischa is boundless. Notwithstanding her self-proclaimed status as a trans ally, she has trafficked in the crudest transphobic stereotypes to describe this woman she is bent on exposing as a fraud and impostor, a leach who sucks the life and productive energy out of others. In the early months of our work together, your reporter saw Mischa as the weak and ineffectual dependent of Maria-Pia, who had "turned Mischa into the

⁷⁷ Likewise, my approach to you this spring demonstrates the same thing.

⁷⁸ Email 7/28/19. This is a good indication of why the women were well advised not to cooperate with your reporter, who had no intention of fairly evaluating and reporting what they shared with her.

⁷⁹ Email 8/10/19.

⁸⁰ Email 7/7/18.

⁸¹ Email 2/22/19.

⁸² Email 9/10/19.

⁸³ Text message 9/14/19.

⁸⁴ Text message 9/14/19.

conniving person she is now.”⁸⁵ Mischa was “zaftig”⁸⁶ and “lazy”;⁸⁷ other people did the “lion’s share of her work”; Maria-Pia used “every man in her path” to prop up her helpless companion.⁸⁸ Mischa could not stand on her own feet at Harvard, and was now trying to “establish herself as a writer” by passing off other people’s work as her own.⁸⁹ Coming across an op-ed Mischa published in *The Guardian* in the fall of 2018, your reporter remarked that Mischa had apparently been “busy”; finding another article by Mischa in *Slate* a few months later, she said: “I wonder who is writing for her these days.”⁹⁰

Your reporter’s words took a darker turn in March 2019, when she finally connected with Andrew Klein’s sister Margaret. As your reporter well knew, Margaret was the person who had called the FBI in 2013, telling the bureau that the *woman* who had “brainwashed” Andrew into marrying her might also be the *man* who had brainwashed the Tsarnaev brothers into committing mass murder.⁹¹ Many reporters would be alarmed by such deranged bigotry coming from a source, and would want to hold the source at arm’s length. But not *your* reporter, who immediately pronounced Margaret to be a “lovely” person, and promised to keep me posted of their interactions.⁹² Since then she has become very close to Margaret, who has become her partner in constructing, in Technicolor, a far more sinister, monstrous figure out of Mischa — a demonic caricature ideal for purposes of your reporter’s True Crime enterprise, as well as for her and her new friend’s personal vendetta against Mischa Haider. Your reporter’s transphobia has come out in the open, along with her patent malice toward this particular trans woman of color whom she finds so threatening.

Mischa Haider only *appears* weak and helpless. In fact, like the Jew of antisemitic tracts, she wields control over everyone around her. Her family — Maria-Pia, Andrew, the three children — is not a family at all, it is a cult, presided over by the trans woman with satanic powers who snatches bodies and colonizes minds. Andrew is there because she “stripped him of his autonomy and his personality and his connections to everyone in his life.”⁹³ Maria-Pia is

⁸⁵ Email 2/21/19.

⁸⁶ Email 1/11/19.

⁸⁷ Email 11/28/18.

⁸⁸ Email 11/28/18.

⁸⁹ Email 11/28/18.

⁹⁰ Email 1/24/19. I worked with Mischa for a long time, in a professional capacity and seen her work and her writing. She is truly brilliant, a gifted writer, and “lazy” is just about the last word anyone who knows her would use to describe her, both professionally and as a mother. Your reporter’s baseless aspersions are the figments of a shallow and insecure imagination.

⁹¹ This is in private investigator Bob Long’s report of May 11, 2018, which your reporter has had since early in our working relationship and has frequently discussed with me.

⁹² Email 3/3/19.

⁹³ Text message 8/29/19.

there because Mischa “also did” this to her, after which she “dropped everyone in her life.”⁹⁴ I myself was nearly sucked in, but escaped Andrew’s fate.⁹⁵ Mischa is a “Davida Koresh” who is “just too lazy to actually have a coherent vision for her cult” because she “can’t get past her victim thing.”⁹⁶

Your reporter *knows* all this nonsense to be true. She just knows it, without having done any reporting. She has never met Mischa, has never spent a moment with her family, has never spoken with any of her family members, has never spoken to anyone (other than me) who has spent any time with her family. Armed with the “knowledge” that blind prejudice provides, she has no need to gather facts and evidence — which in any event would support her thesis, no matter what they revealed. If they contradicted her thesis — if, for example, it were to emerge that this family is no less “wholesome,” healthy and loving than any other — it would only prove how thoroughly the women had hidden the truth, underscoring the cult leader’s control over others.

This trope — portraying trans individuals as “cult” leaders who brainwash normal, healthy individuals into joining their ranks — is a common slur, figuring prominently in the folklore of transphobia.⁹⁷ It is front and center in your reporter’s vision for her book-in-progress. To help me understand what Mischa did to Andrew and nearly did to me, she has passed on to me a book recommendation from Andrew’s sister, Margaret: *Terror, Love & Brainwashing: Attachment in Cults and Totalitarian Systems*.⁹⁸ Discussing a possible television series based on her work, your reporter proposed that the working title “Untitled Gullible Man Project” be replaced with the working title “Asshole Trans Cult Leader Project.”⁹⁹

This is not a family but a cult, and Mischa is not a wife and mother but a sinister illusionist. Your reporter disparages Mischa’s role as mother to three children and wife to Andrew, joining the chorus of transphobes who cannot believe that a trans woman is actually capable of mothering and being loved as a mother by her children, or that a cis man could genuinely be in love with and attracted to a trans woman and could have a healthy marriage with her. After reading Mischa’s article about the prejudice and disbelief she experiences as a trans mother, your reporter says the article overstates Mischa’s actual parental responsibilities, and surmises that she

⁹⁴ Text message 8/29/19.

⁹⁵ Text message 9/30/19 (“So basically all the shit that they were pulling on you they had pulled on Andrew but on a whole other level.”).

⁹⁶ Text message 8/29/19.

⁹⁷ For example, “I’ve Lost Two Kids to the Trans Cult,” <https://www.christianpost.com/news/ive-lost-two-kids-trans-cult-i-want-them-back-anguished-mom-shares-her-journey.html>.

⁹⁸ Text message 10/18/19 (“Margaret wanted me to pass on a book recommendation to you that she says has really helped her a lot”).

⁹⁹ Text message 8/29/19.

is taking credit for the parenting done by others in her household.¹⁰⁰ To your reporter, Mischa's ensnarement of Andrew was "breathtakingly awful";¹⁰¹ the women used sleep deprivation and other brainwashing techniques to sever him from friends and family; he remains with Mischa because he is trapped in a "fugue state" from which she hopes her work will "awaken" him.¹⁰² Your reporter will brook no dissent from me:

BH: Rereading those text messages among the three of them from 2016 and 2017. Don't underestimate Andrew's agency.

KB: He has been weaponized yes. Been thinking about that lately

BH: No, no. You need to reread. He is leaning on Mischa hard. To get me out, to take the LSAT, other things. He is not just taking orders, he is giving them. [...]

KB: Yes and telling them what they want to hear. And been programmed.¹⁰³

This exchange is typical of many in which my efforts to complicate or qualify your reporter's narrative were dismissed out of hand.

To your reporter, nothing is real about this impostor. The street harassment Mischa experiences as a trans woman is nothing but a "dark fantasy."¹⁰⁴ The death from AIDS of a beloved partner, movingly recounted in an essay she published, is pure invention.¹⁰⁵ She conceals everything about her true identity — her parentage, her ethnicity, her names, her birthplace. Your reporter, bent on unmasking her, has made it her mission to track down details from her past, apparently oblivious to the reasons that trans individuals do not publicize these things. Your reporter ignores the real threats and dangers a trans woman may be exposed to by invading her private life, her past relations, her former partners, dead-naming her in the process to obtain any salacious details she can procure.

But exposure is not enough for your reporter. That is the reason she called my and Brooks' attention to the recent federal prosecution of a "kind of a cult leader" in New York for "psychological manipulation" and urged Brooks to consider seeking comparable federal charges

¹⁰⁰ Email 7/17/19. I will not rebut all of your reporter's vicious delusions, but I must say something about this one. I know firsthand Mischa's dedication as a mother and devoted immersion in her children's upbringing, and once wrote about it publicly.

¹⁰¹ Text message 8/28/19.

¹⁰² Text message 9/14/19. Once again, this oft-repeated idea of hers, no less vicious than her claim about Mischa's motherhood, is also completely disconnected from the reality of Andrew's life with Mischa as I myself often observed it.

¹⁰³ Text message exchange 12/21/19.

¹⁰⁴ Email 3/7/19.

¹⁰⁵ Email 3/7/19.

against Mischa and Maria-Pia.¹⁰⁶ The True Crime enterprise really requires the women to be charged with a crime — preferably a sensational one, and the sooner the better. Law enforcement authorities do not appear to appreciate the gravity of their offenses or the urgency of putting the women away for a long time. Why *shouldn't* your reporter get her sources to give them a little nudge, as she continues her “obsessive quest” for a quarry that will outdo Michelle McNamara?

Your reporter has been hoping to see the women prosecuted and imprisoned since the day I first contacted her, when she said “I hope they rot.”¹⁰⁷ Better still, she would like their prosecution and imprisonment to be the product of her own crusade against the women. Thus, she made sure to inform Cooper and Brooks of contacts from sources who might serve as witnesses against the women. She encouraged sources who might qualify as victims to retain one of the lawyers. She encouraged me to call the police about what she hoped were possible grounds for prosecution. As it became clear to her that authorities were not interested in prosecuting the women because they had not committed any crimes, she began proposing wild and nonsensical legal theories to me and my lawyers. She is desperate to see them convicted and imprisoned.

Her reaction to the larceny charges mistakenly brought (and now dropped) against the women¹⁰⁸ reveal how unhinged her quest for “justice” has become. She encouraged me to call the police about the bank withdrawals in question, thrilled at my discovery — “Wow. So there’s proof”¹⁰⁹ — of something that might get them prosecuted.¹¹⁰ She was delighted to see charges brought and arrest warrants issued against the women, who were never even notified of the proceeding.¹¹¹ She relished the prospect that, if they returned to the United States while the warrants were pending, they would be taken into custody by federal law enforcement agents; she knew full well that this would expose Mischa to violence and potentially life-threatening danger, and was glad of it.¹¹² She was thrilled to learn that the pending warrants were deterring the

¹⁰⁶ Email 2/12/20, sent to Brooks and me.

¹⁰⁷ Text message 6/24/18.

¹⁰⁸ In March 2019, the Middlesex District Attorney’s office charged the women with misdemeanor larceny, following my discovery that they had made transfers from my bank account that I did not recall authorizing. In a February 2020 filing in the civil litigation between us, the women’s counsel pointed out I had in fact given the women authority to make the transfers. I notified the Middlesex DA of my mistake, and have recently learned that the charges were dropped and the associated arrest warrants recalled.

¹⁰⁹ Email 12/6/18.

¹¹⁰ A more responsible reporter would have asked me about the circumstances of the withdrawals, and would have floated the possibility that I had forgotten authorizing them. But not your reporter, who unfailingly encouraged me to see anything the women had done in the worst possible light.

¹¹¹ The women were in France when the charges were brought and were never notified to appear in court. When they failed to appear at their arraignment in April 2019, the Cambridge District Court issued default arrest warrants for them, which they learned about only several months later.

¹¹² In phone conversations with me, she often gloated about the mistreatment Mischa would face at the hands of ICE officials under the Trump administration.

women from returning to the United States to defend themselves against the groundless proceedings that had been brought against them; complimented Howard Cooper for exploiting this; crowed when Cooper's strategy resulted in a default judgment against the women in Jay Scuteri's case; and looked forward to seeing the same strategy result in a default judgment against them in my own case. Her unconcealed delight at these serial injustices and life-threatening dangers for the women — all over a few hundred dollars that I (mistakenly) thought the women had taken without permission *during our relationship*¹¹³ — now leaves me speechless.

Just consider. After the warrants were issued, the women faced a stark choice: fly to the United States and risk Mischa's life in the custody of Trump's border security agents, or stay away and forfeit the chance to defend themselves in court. They faced this choice precisely because Mischa is a trans woman of color. A pricey lawyer promptly exploited this to procure a judgment against them on behalf of a wealthy white man the women had accused of rape. A clearer case of the sheer rot afflicting our justice and law enforcement institutions — ordinarily of such concern to the editors of *New York* — can hardly be imagined. Your reporter was not troubled by this. She was overjoyed by it.

New York can take credit for the legal obscenity I have just described. In November 2019, the women sought to have the warrants recalled on the ground that they had not been properly notified of the criminal proceeding; Judge Sragow of the Cambridge District Court denied their motion, making fairly clear that she had read your reporter's articles. In the civil litigation, the women sought an extension of time arguing that entry of a default judgment was unconscionable under the circumstances; Judge Green of the Middlesex Superior Court denied their motion, after Cooper called her attention to your reporter's articles in his opposition papers.

Your reporter also hopes to help Margaret, her friend and fellow fabulist, pry Andrew loose from the women so he can resume a healthy, normal, un-brainwashed life. In late 2019, I told her that Andrew was scheduled to appear for a deposition in Boston in January 2020. She duly relayed that to Margaret, and later told me that Margaret was considering plans to intercept him there and dissuade him from returning to France. Your reporter also hopes that when he does eventually free himself from the women, he should take "those poor kids" with them.¹¹⁴ Because causing a trans woman to be stripped of her three children, along with her losing her husband, is just the sort of thing *New York* wants to be known for.

Let me be clear about this. For your reporter, breaking up this family and wrecking these women's lives is not just some tragic by-product of her relentless search for the truth. It is her *objective*. As they say of Trump, the cruelty is the point. This project has never been about the

¹¹³ The bank transfers occurred in July 2017, just after our return from Canada.

¹¹⁴ Text message 8/29/19.

search for truth; it was always about making these women “rot,” and then watching the credits roll.¹¹⁵

With *New York*'s help, she has had considerable success. Though the family remains intact, the articles have essentially destroyed their lives, and irreparably damaged the lives of their children. The world has lost the voice of a brilliant writer and commentator on trans rights, gender equality, and other political subjects. Trans girls have lost the rarest of role models — a trans woman in a loving marriage to a cis man, only mother to her three children, earning a PhD at Harvard. That is the achievement of the individuals responsible for the publication of these shameful articles.

IV. THE ARTICLES' MISREPRESENTATIONS

A. Overview

The lead article was primarily about my relationship with the two women, along with short accounts about three other men I had brought to your reporter's attention — Scuteri (referred to as John Doe in the lead article,) Poe, and Roe. In addition to being the main source for the story about my own relationship with the women, I was the only source for the stories about Poe and Roe. Your reporter never spoke to Poe or Roe or anyone connected to them. None of this is disclosed to the reader.

Your reporter never confirmed with them, or anyone connected to them, the accuracy of her account; she never asked these individuals whether her account matched their own perceptions or understanding of events; she never got their permission to publish her account. She relied entirely on written materials I had given to her, along with my own interpretation of the materials. I, the source, have never spoken to either men and have no idea what they themselves think about any of this. None of this is disclosed to the reader, either.

As for Scuteri: your reporter did indeed speak to him, and has repeated his accusations against them. But she inexplicably forgot to mention one thing: the women have publicly accused this individual of having raped Maria-Pia. On what conceivable basis would you print his accusations against the women, but not their accusation against him? What responsible journalistic outfit would *ever* give such a one-sided account of a dispute?

In short: your lead article consists of one story (mine) whose main source has retracted; two stories (Poe and Roe) that are completely uncorroborated; and one more (Doe) whose one-sidedness constitutes journalistic malpractice.

¹¹⁵ Text message 6/24/18.

The result of this farce is pure defamation. The lead article creates a deeply false portrayal of these women as serial predators who terrorize men and shake them down for money. The false light generated by this portrayal is then magnified by the second article, in which a mostly inconsequential series of alleged encounters on the street becomes “proof” of the predatory view of the women developed by the first article. Combined, the articles deceive readers into believing highly inflammatory charges on the basis of what is, on inspection, essentially nonexistent evidence — charges that, I repeat, are completely false. This is a small-scale version of what despots and to create public enemies out of the unpopular groups and marginalized people. It is not journalism.

B. Lead Article

1. My Story

As I have stated before, the magazine’s story about me converts a complex relationship among three people into a *Fatal Attraction*-style thriller of crazed females tormenting a hapless man and his family, a fiction having no relation to the truth. In a subsequent letter, I will give a detailed, point-by-point refutation of the story; here I will just summarize the problems.

1. The article’s claim that I was seduced into the relationship is completely false. From the beginning, I spent as much time chasing Maria-Pia as she did me. I drew her in with the false representation that my attachment to Jennifer would pose no barrier to a relationship. The fact is, I was no more a “mark” than were the women, who felt deceived and manipulated because my representation was false.

2. The claim that I was the victim of a paternity trap is also utterly false. I would have wanted to be with the women even if the pregnancy had never happened. I am convinced Maria-Pia told me I had caused the pregnancy because she knew I would leave immediately if I found out that another man might have caused it. Anyone who reads the 2000 or so pages of text message traffic between the three of us can see that the baby played essentially no role in the relationship.

3. The portrayal of my relationship with Mischa is misleading, offensive, and transphobic. I was in love with her; our love was romantic; it was not sexual because she is asexual. The article’s insinuations that I was somehow used in this relationship is nonsense, and deploys bigoted stereotype that trans women are somehow unlovable and unattractive. This aspect of the article simply enrages me.

4. The claim that the women sought to separate me from my family, or to part me from my money, is nonsense. As I said before, they simply did not want to be mistresses, and resented the fact that I was effectively asking them to financially subsidize Jennifer — who rewarded their overtures to her with unrelenting hostility, and did all she could to sabotage the relationship.

5. The claim that this relationship was a scam, or was any less genuine on the women's part than on mine, is contradicted by the written correspondence among us, which your reporter and the article's editors show little sign of having read.

6. The claim that Mischa's Title IX complaint was an act of fraud, extortion, and abuse of process is false.¹¹⁶

Scheming females, hapless man, defenseless wife and children — your reporter wanted a made-for-Netflix narrative. That is why, days after declaring that this was the most difficult story she had ever reported, she gushed at the prospect of a "nice bidding war" in Hollywood — "great news for us, drives up the price" — for the movie and TV rights.¹¹⁷ To her dismay, the bidding never materialized. Meanwhile, I have searched without success for evidence that she had ever before reported a story, difficult or otherwise.

2. Poe, Roe and Scuteri (Doe)

These men create the "series" that, in the lead article's telling, make the women "serial" predators who shake men down for money. This part of the article is outrageous, as I am going to take some pains to show here.

To recap: I was the one who informed your reporter about all three of these men, having gotten stories about them from my lawyers Brooks and Cooper. Both of these lawyers had built up a narrative that the women were serial grifters. This position was expedient to them for purposes of advocacy; both are criminal lawyers, and are accustomed to using "scorched-earth" tactics against adversaries. (Cooper also had a pronounced, palpable antipathy toward the two women.) They had no trouble convincing me of their view of the women, which was also being pushed on me by Jennifer. They were my echo chamber, as I've suggested, which your reporter promptly joined.

I must emphasize how profoundly this echo chamber affected my own perceptions. My life seemed to be falling apart; I was stuck at home, talking to almost no one but your reporter, Jennifer, and the lawyers. I lost the reality check that comes from communicating with people with different viewpoints. I became radicalized, developing an extreme view of the women that bore no relation to my actual experience with them. From then on I interpreted each bit of information in the worst possible light. Your reporter was instrumental in this process; any time I wavered in my view of the women as predators, or suggested that it could be simplistic or wrong,

¹¹⁶ As I said at the end of part II above: I no more sexually harassed Mischa than she and Maria-Pia extorted me. However, I can readily see how — in the heat of conflict — she could genuinely believe in charges against me that were not true and that she herself would not have believed under less stressful and adversarial circumstances. I can readily see this because I was led to believe in charges against her that were not true, as I myself would have recognized absent the fraught circumstances that kept me in an echo chamber.

¹¹⁷ Bolonik email 8/15/19.

your reporter pushed me back to the party line. Looking back, I am reminded of news stories about the online radicalization of “incels,” members of forums such as 4chan, and other disciples of conspiracy theories and extreme ideologies.

I will add that this extreme view of the women has the same viral quality — the same potency and contagiousness — as those virulent forms of online misogyny. It is easily harnessed by people who have something to gain from demonizing the women, and unfortunately finds a receptive audience in all too many readers and listeners bearing conscious or unconscious biases, for whom these strange, unconventional women are both a source of entertainment and confirmation of those biases. Your reporter has shamelessly exploited this situation out of a variety of motives — self-promotion, professional jealousy toward Mischa, and a deep-seated animosity toward Mischa that has grown into what, as I’ve suggested, can only be called a personal vendetta. The *New York* articles have become the principal vehicle for the viral spread of the false view of these women that has no more basis in reality than the other delusions and conspiracy theories accepted as fact in 4chan and similar fever swamps.

That is the process by which Roe, Poe and Scuteri have become part of these women’s mythical “trail of victims,” and central components of the demonology surrounding the women. Let us look at the falsehoods and evidentiary gaps in this “trail of victims” picture.

John Poe

First, your reporter never spoke to this individual or anyone connected to him.

- She relied entirely on material I had given her and my interpretation of it.¹¹⁸
- I myself have never spoken to this individual or anyone connected to him.
- The published account was unsourced, and made no use of publicly available documents (of which there are none).
- The reporter obtained no corroboration of the account and does not have this individual’s permission to publish it.

Second, the sole document on which the entire published account is based is the transcript from the 2014 proceeding in which Maria-Pia sought a restraining order against Poe.

- The proceeding was impounded by the courts in 2016, making all records from it unavailable.
- The transcript is uncertified and is not an official court document. Your reporter got it from me, and I got it from Doug Brooks.
- Neither she nor I had any way of verifying its accuracy or completeness.

¹¹⁸ This was a matter on which your reporter repeatedly consulted me, not only for my perspectives but also for my legal analysis to inform her reporting.

Third, the published account is based entirely on Poe's testimony in the transcript, which the published account presents as fact.

- In this proceeding, Poe was represented by counsel but Maria-Pia was not.
- Poe was not cross-examined by anyone, and the judge asked essentially no questions.
- The reporter presents this un-crossed testimony as fact, without ever having spoken to him or anyone connected to the events in question.
- There were four witnesses at the proceeding — Poe, Poe's then-girlfriend, Maria-Pia, and Mischa. Your reporter has not spoken to any of them, or to anyone else with knowledge of what happened.

Fourth, your reporter's account is contradicted by the very document on which she relies.

- The article suggests that the woman named Jacqueline Lescarret does not really exist, implying that she is a fabrication of Maria-Pia and Mischa's. In fact, Poe and his lawyer repeatedly state that Poe has met Lescarret in person on numerous occasions.
- The article states that Maria-Pia's request for a restraining order followed Poe's request for a restraining order against Lescarret, implying that Maria-Pia's request was an act of retaliation.¹¹⁹ In fact, the document makes clear that Poe sought his restraining order three days after Maria-Pia began the proceeding against him.
- The article states that the baby born in 2011 could not possibly be the product of Poe's encounters with Maria-Pia because the last such encounter was in 2009. In fact, the transcript says quite clearly that they were last together in 2011.
- All three of these assertions in the article are used by the reporter as dramatic indications that Maria-Pia and Mischa are brazen fraudsters and manipulators of the legal system. In fact, all three are the imaginings of someone who has simply not read the document she is reporting on.

Fifth, the published account falsely implies that the court rejected Maria-Pia's assertion that Poe had sexually assaulted her five years earlier.

- The entire focus of the hearing was on whether Poe's threatening words toward Maria-Pia, as reported by Mischa, posed a sufficient danger to warrant extension of the restraining order.
- The court denied the restraining order after it became clear that Poe had not seen Maria-Pia in years; that he had not spoken with her in nearly a year; and that his primary interactions in the episode had been with Lescarret and Mischa.
- Maria-Pia's assault accusation was scarcely discussed at the hearing; it was not adjudicated by the court; and the judge expressed no view about it.

¹¹⁹ It does not explain how he could have brought this proceeding if Lescarret did not exist.

- In addition, the judge made no credibility findings and gave no indication that he disbelieved anything the women had said.

Sixth, I have obtained new information that further undercuts the account offered in the article.

- A third-party bank subpoena has revealed that Maria-Pia had transferred to Poe at least \$10,000 a few years before the \$11,000 payment he claimed to have made to Maria-Pia via Lescarret. This contradicts the idea that he was somehow being defrauded and extorted into paying them money.
- Poe sent Mischa a number of warm communications, including a hand-written Mothers' Day card, in the period after the restraining order proceeding. This is hardly compatible with the idea that he viewed himself as a victim of Maria-Pia and Mischa's.

Finally:

- Poe has resisted all of my attempts, as well as your reporter's attempts, to contact him.
- At the time of the conflict Poe sought a restraining order against Lescarret, but not Maria-Pia and Mischa, further contradicting the idea that they were menacing him in some way.

In view of all this, I cannot see how anyone could believe it is journalistically responsible to portray Poe as the victim of fraud, extortion, false sexual assault accusations, or indeed anything else, at the hands of these women.

Please note: Poe's is the *only case in which one of the women's purported victims paid them money or even was asked to pay them money*. It is now clear that he paid them money to repay Maria-Pia for money she had given him. None of the other men in the articles was ever asked for money.¹²⁰

Richard Roe

First: once again, your reporter never spoke to this individual or anyone connected to him.

¹²⁰ As I noted before, Anthony of the followup article confirmed to me that Maria-Pia never suggested she wanted money from him. Roe and Scuteri's lawyers (Brooks and Cooper, respectively) have confirmed to me that neither man was asked for money.

- She relied entirely on material I had given her and my interpretation of it.¹²¹
- I myself have never spoken to this individual or anyone connected to him.
- The published account was unsourced, and made no use of publicly available documents (of which there are none).
- The reporter obtained no corroboration of the account and does not have this individual's permission to publish it.

Second, the documents on which the entire published account is based are purported text correspondence between Roe and Maria-Pia, and email correspondence between Roe's lawyer, Doug Brooks, and Maria-Pia's lawyer, Ruth O'Meara Costello.

- Your reporter got them from me, and I got them from Doug Brooks.
- Neither she nor I had any way of verifying their authenticity or completeness.
- Your reporter did not speak to either party to the purported text correspondence to check whether it was authentic, altered, or taken out of context. In addition, she did not get their permission to use it.
- Your reporter did not reach out to or speak to Costello to corroborate the authenticity or completeness of the email correspondence and to verify that it was not altered or taken out of context.¹²²

Third, the published account is based entirely on my interpretation of the purported text correspondence between Roe and Maria-Pia, and email correspondence between Brooks and Costello, and on what Brooks had told me about it.

- To resolve the conflict between Roe and Maria-Pia, Brooks had demanded that Maria-Pia sign a confidentiality agreement which he drafted and presented to Maria-Pia for her signature. Maria-Pia signed it but Roe did not. My understanding is that most people would view this agreement as legally binding under these circumstances.
- So far as I am aware neither of the parties to the conflict has ever said anything about what happened between them. The only person who has spoken about it was the lawyer who pressured Maria-Pia to sign an agreement silencing her.
- I think it is highly troubling for any journalistic outfit to publish, under such circumstances, the lawyer's account of what happened between the parties. The lawyer has in effect engineered a situation in which he considers himself free to tell his version of the story, while Maria-Pia exposes herself to liability if she even opens her mouth about it.

¹²¹ This was a matter on which your reporter repeatedly consulted me, not only for my perspectives but also for my legal analysis to inform her reporting. Not only was I her source and giving her my thoughts, but I was also her expert legal consultant. And I think it's obvious the ethical problems that arise.

¹²² Your reporter kept me apprised of the lawyers she was speaking to and most certainly would have told me if she had spoken to Costello.

Fourth, the article falsely implies that Maria-Pia sought money from Roe.

- Brooks has confirmed to me that Maria-Pia never asked his client for money.
- In her correspondence with Brooks, Costello emphasizes (without objection from Brooks) that Maria-Pia has made no demands for money.
- In the text correspondence, Maria-Pia makes no demand for money. Once the conversation between Maria-Pia and Roe becomes adversarial, Maria-Pia tells him that he ought to get a lawyer and that any further communication should be through lawyers. This is not the behavior of someone seeking to defraud or extort someone with a groundless paternity claim.

Finally, as I described in Part II above, the Brooks letter — on which my understanding of the Roe story was based, and passed on to your reporter — was completely misleading.

- The letter portrayed the Roe case as one of a series of “extortion schemes.”
- The instances he gave of such “schemes” — involving Poe, Andrew, and the unnamed man on Tinder — contained no evidence of extortion.
- The letter misleadingly implied that there was such evidence, in order to create the impression that Maria-Pia’s interaction with Roe — a legal nonevent — was the beginning of another such scheme.

Here again: In view of all this, I cannot see how anyone could believe it is journalistically responsible to portray Roe as the victim of fraud, extortion, or indeed anything else of legal significance.

Jeffrey “Jay” Scuteri (John Doe)¹²³

The more you look at your coverage of this man, the more disturbing it becomes.

First, it is very troubling that your article allows *him* to remain cloaked in anonymity, given that your reporter made clear to me that there was “no way” she would ever grant Maria-Pia and Mischa’s request to remain anonymous.¹²⁴ *Your article grants anonymity to a credibly accused rapist, while naming his victim without her consent.*

Second, the published account entirely omits an all-important fact: in Scuteri’s lawsuit against them, the women have alleged that he raped Maria-Pia.¹²⁵ It is truly astonishing that your

¹²³ As I have indicated before, I name this individual here because he has filed a lawsuit in his own name that is a matter of public record.

¹²⁴ This seems to me a good indication of how little interest your reporter had in producing a balanced story or in securing the women’s trust and participation.

¹²⁵ This is in their pleadings, which are publicly available, and your reporter is well aware of it.

article includes Scuteri's accusations against the women, but *excludes* their accusation against him and *does not ask him to answer it*.

- The omission creates an unfairly one-sided picture of the dispute between Scuteri and the women, and conceals a motive he has to lie about what happened.
- It also deprives the reader of information essential to evaluating your claim that the women have falsely accused others of sexual assault.
- Your article essentially "convicts" the women of making false sexual assault accusations against Poe, whom your reporter never spoke to.
- Here we have, in Scuteri, a man they have accused of sexual assault, whom your reporter spoke to. Did your reporter ask him about their accusation? What did he say? Is there any evidence bearing on the question?

The omission of the sexual assault allegation, and your reporter's refusal to look into it and report what she found, can only be called journalistic malpractice.

A question: would it have been acceptable to print the women's sexual assault accusation against Scuteri, without printing the accusations he has made against them? If not, why was it OK for you to print *his* accusations but not *theirs*?

Third, the fact of that allegation may help explain some otherwise inexplicable behavior of Scuteri's, who — as I noted in part II above — seems very reluctant for the evidence in this case to be aired in court.

- He and Cooper began threatening the women with a lawsuit in March 2016. There were negotiations that spring between Cooper and the women's lawyer Costello, which apparently quickly broke down.
- Scuteri did not file suit after negotiations broke down. He remained reluctant to sue even after I contacted Cooper with my own story in the fall of 2017, and after I alerted Cooper to the Brooks letter in the spring of 2018.
- He finally brought suit a couple of months after I filed my own lawsuit, when it would have been apparent to him that he and the women were likely to be deposition witnesses.
- Cooper stated to me that his strategy was to seek a judgment in his client's favor with no trial or adjudication on the merits.

- Now that he has won a default judgment, Cooper and his client show no interest in scheduling a hearing to prove his damages,¹²⁶ a hearing at which evidence of the sexual assault would likely emerge.

Fourth, the evidence available to me supports the sexual assault accusation.

- Maria-Pia has alleged that Scuteri raped her in the encounter that had been initiated by him. She reported it to Mischa and Andrew the day it occurred; the following day she and Mischa reported it to a friend — FG, a former police officer — to seek his advice.
- Contrary to the inflammatory and groundless suggestion in the lead article and by your reporter that Maria-Pia has a history of making false rape reports, there is no evidence of this.¹²⁷
- Mischa disclosed to me on several occasions in 2016 and 2017 that Scuteri had sexually assaulted Maria-Pia.¹²⁸ These conversations occurred during our relationship, when she had no reason to lie to me about such a thing.
- Maria-Pia disclosed to me in the summer of 2017 that Scuteri had raped her. She also had no reason at that point to lie to me about this.

¹²⁶ As noted above in part III, Cooper exploited the arrest warrants against the women to secure a default judgment against them in the Scuteri litigation. His strategy succeeded because Judge Sragow of the Cambridge District Court (who in May 2020 ordered the mistaken charges to be dismissed at the DA's request) declined to recall the warrants despite the fact that the women had not received proper notice of their arraignment, and because Judge Green of the Middlesex Superior Court declined to give them a time extension despite the manifest danger Mischa would face as a transgender woman of color if she were to be detained by federal law enforcement while entering the US with the default warrants in place. Both judges were highly dismissive of the women's legal positions, and both judges had rather clearly read your reporter's articles and, like many, had been influenced by the false light to assume the women were villains. *New York* can therefore take credit for assisting Cooper's exploitation of the Trump ICE's prejudice toward transgender women of color to secure a victory for his client while avoiding a ruling on the merits of Maria-Pia's rape accusation against the client. Your articles have now severely impaired the women's ability to receive due process even in courts.

Once again, one would ordinarily expect *New York* to express outrage at the manifest injustice of putting a transgender woman of color to the choice between risking her life in the hands of federal border control agents or giving up her right to defend herself in Scuteri's lawsuit — all because of a (mistaken) misdemeanor charge. The episode should be part of the national debate we are having over the harms endured by vulnerable minority groups through our law enforcement and court machinery. That the misdemeanor charges were ever filed in the first place can be chalked up to my misguided relationship with your reporter, who never failed to share her view that the women were "grifters."

¹²⁷ As I discussed in part II.C above, the police have credited the complaints she has made about men harassing and threatening her. I am not aware of a single instance in which the police have disbelieved a complaint she has made to them, about sexual assault or anything else.

¹²⁸ She did not tell me his name, and said little about the circumstances beyond telling me that he was threatening groundless litigation against the women and was represented by Howard Cooper.

- FG, the former cop, has recently confirmed to me that the women spoke with him the day after the second encounter, and told him a man had sexually assaulted her the previous day; that Maria-Pia was distraught and unsure what to do; and that he advised her to at least file a report with police in order to document the episode; and that he had a followup call with Maria-Pia a few weeks later, in which she said she did not want to pursue the Scuteri matter with law enforcement because she was pregnant and there was a chance the pregnancy resulted from that encounter.

Fifth, the evidence available to me casts serious doubt on Scuteri's account, which the article presents as fact.

- Though Maria-Pia appears to have initially approached Scuteri, which led to their encounter at the Taj Hotel,¹²⁹ it was *he* who contacted Maria-Pia several weeks later after this encounter to ask her if she was in town and wanted to meet again.
- This encounter — *initiated by Scuteri* — was the one after which Maria-Pia contacted him to say she was pregnant; it is also the one in which Maria-Pia alleged Scuteri raped her and filmed her.
- None of this is disclosed in the article, presumably because it undercuts Scuteri's story that the women targeted him in a scheme.

Further:

- Before Scuteri's first encounter with Maria-Pia, he met with her and Mischa for a drink.¹³⁰ During that drink, Scuteri took one or more surreptitious photos of Mischa.¹³¹ Why would he take and retain such a picture of *Mischa* over a casual drink?¹³² This is creepy, predatory behavior directed at a trans woman, which should not be lost on anyone. What was he planning to use the photo for? Any number of dark possibilities come to mind.
- Aside from raising questions about his credibility as a source, the surreptitious photograph is obviously strong substantive evidence supporting Maria-Pia's contention that Scuteri secretly filmed their second sexual encounter and then threatened her with disclosure of the video.
- We all know that women are targets of revenge porn far more often than men. Scuteri has evidenced his propensity to take surreptitious photographs and retain

¹²⁹ This encounter was uneventful.

¹³⁰ This is undisputed by the parties in the litigation.

¹³¹ This emerged in the Title IX proceeding, whose investigator stated in her report that Cooper had provided her with a photo of Mischa and had explained that Scuteri had taken it without Mischa's knowledge during the drink. A copy of the photo is in the Title IX record.

¹³² If Scuteri had some qualms about the encounter, they certainly did not prevent him from going up to her room after the drink or reaching out to see her again a few weeks later.

them for no reason. In contrast, there is no evidence that Maria-Pia and Mischa have ever done such a thing.

- None of this is disclosed in the article, presumably because it discredits Scuteri and his story.

In sum:

Jay Scuteri raped Maria-Pia. This seems clear to me.

The above evidence not only undercuts Scuteri's story about being "victimized" by these women; it strongly suggests that he victimized *them* by sexually assaulting Maria-Pia and threatening them with the circulation of revenge porn.

The evidence therefore casts serious doubt on the article's entire thesis that the women are predators who pretend to be victims.

New York has failed to disclose any of that evidence. Indeed, it has failed to alert the reader *in any way* to the women's side of the story, which is detailed in their public filings in the litigation.

This is simply outrageous.

It is my belief that I was in effect used by Howard Cooper to help him create a smokescreen over Maria-Pia's highly credible rape accusation against his client. *New York* has allowed itself to be used in the same way.

C. The Followup Article

I will comment briefly on these vignettes, which say more about the individuals responsible for producing these articles than they do about their subjects.

1. The Aaron Holman story: This made-up story¹³³ seeks nothing more than to ridicule women for stepping out of traditional gender roles.

2. The Steve story: When this individual contacted Bolonik in August 2019, her editor Genevieve Smith wrote to a colleague: "Kera talked to another guy who dodged a bullet."¹³⁴ I would love to know what "bullet" was dodged in this made-up story,¹³⁵ whose purpose is to imply that there is something wrong with the kids having a trans mother, that the

¹³³ Mischa does not drive, as I well know, and neither of them would ever be so boorish as to catcall someone.

¹³⁴ Bolonik email 7/25/19. Bolonik forwarded me Smith's note, along with her correspondence with the man, including his name (Scott Woodbury) and his email address, and said I could pass it on to my lawyer Brooks.

¹³⁵ Maria-Pia would never hide from anyone, much less a relative, that Mischa was the mother of their children.

women know they have to hide this, and are willing to do manipulative and deceptive things to avoid being found out.

3. The Jordan story: If true, establishes that Maria-Pia was “forward” with a man and insistently sought his attention. This is surely powerful proof of guilt, because only men are allowed to act that way; if a woman does it, there is something sinister afoot.

4. The David and Carl story: When the source contacted Bolonik, she forwarded his email to me for my opinion. Here is my colloquy with her:

BH: There’s a problem with the date though. In fall 2015, she was visibly pregnant. I wonder if he means the spring.

KB: I just asked him about that after getting the email. I said, wait she would have been pregnant. Waiting to hear back. He did say it was late at night, he may not have noticed. Was she huge at five, six months?

BH: I wonder if he still has the texts. If he or others really want to be helpful, they could get cell phone records to pin down dates.

KB: He says he doesn’t have the texts anymore but maybe his friend does. He said he realizes it must have been summer now because it happened before his Sept 1 2015 move.

After conferring with his friend they remembered it was April/May 2015.¹³⁶

The article simply says that this non-story occurred “in the Spring of 2015.” Take this little exchange, and the published result, as an indication of your reporter’s professionalism and integrity.

5. The childhood friend story: This individual’s mother contacted me; I passed the note on to your reporter who then contacted the individual, and alleged childhood friend. The article refers to no evidence provided by the individual to support her story, and cites no corroboration. The story itself is implausible and completely at odds with everything I know about Mischa: she is asexual; she vocally opposes attaching value to physical appearance;¹³⁷ she would never participate, or encourage participation, in hook-up culture.

This anecdote showcases the indiscriminate sexualization of trans women that (like their indiscriminate portrayal as cult leaders) is central to the vocabulary of transphobia. Equally

¹³⁶ Bolonik email 7/27/19.

¹³⁷ As a reader of our text message correspondence would know, she made that position abundantly clear to me more than once.

noteworthy is the anecdote's stereotype-laden claim that Mischa "corrupted" Maria-Pia. Here we have, in a nutshell, the narrative your reporter is developing: Maria-Pia and Andrew were both leading normal lives until Mischa came along to recruit them into her cult, transforming Maria-Pia into a nymphomaniac and Andrew into a "lab rat"¹³⁸ who has been conditioned into believing he is Mischa's husband.

6. The Anthony story: Oddly, the article neglects to say whether Maria-Pia ever sought money from this man.

Given what she had written in the lead article about fraud and extortion schemes, and the women's use of money demands to control and manipulate men, it is intriguing that your reporter did not ask this man about it — and (if she did ask) that she did not tell the reader the answer he gave.

As you can see from the "David and Carl" exchange immediately above, your reporter has no problem asking sources questions (or feeding them answers) about minor details like the date of an encounter with the women. When Anthony contacted her immediately after the lead article came out, she had a perfect opportunity to test the thesis of the lead article. The money question is not, after all, a minor detail, but central to the claim that these women are serial extortionists.

Did it really not occur to your reporter to ask him? Or did she just not like the answer he gave?

V. CONCLUSION

A few months ago, when I was starting to have doubts about the trial, conviction, and execution — in nearly every sense but the literal one — of these two women, I myself asked Anthony whether Maria-Pia had sought to get money out of him. His answer, of course, was no.¹³⁹

This was shortly after my realizations that my "bank theft" accusations against the women, which had led to criminal charges, were simply false. They had emerged from my discovery, in 2018, of some withdrawals the women had made from my account — which, courtesy of my echo chamber, I promptly construed in the worst possible light. As I have said, your reporter was thrilled at this discovery of "proof" of crime, encouraged me to report it, and

¹³⁸ Text message 9/14/19

¹³⁹ I also asked him whether she had accused him, or threatened to accuse him, of sexual assault. The answer was no.

I should add that of the men discussed in the articles, he is the only one with whom I have had direct communications.

was pleased to see charges brought. There was only one problem: I had authorized the women to use the account, and they put more money into it than they took out.¹⁴⁰

These serial extortionists never seem to get around to actually *extorting* anyone.

Which can be a real problem for a couple of articles that are basically an extended riff on private investigator Long's vision of a "deviant scheme to extort money from young men for purposes of financial gain." That is why, like the 2015 Brooks letter on which they are based, the articles conceal their sourcing, misrepresent the evidence, and deceive the reader into believing in a nonexistent case against the women. This is about creating criminals, not exposing them.

Look at the trajectory of this false narrative. The ludicrous imaginings of Andrew's relatives lead to the P.I.'s "deviant scheme," which leads to the pseudo-facts of the Brooks letter, which leads me to write of the women's "campaign of fraud, extortion and false accusations," which leads to the two articles built around that very phrase, which leads to a forthcoming book whose main source will be none other than — Margaret Klein, the first to intuit that Mischa, dark-skinned trans cult leader and brainwasher of men, just may have masterminded the Boston Marathon bombing. This would all be funny, if it weren't ruining the lives of real people.

The stories of these women's supposed predations, as I suggested before, have a snowballing effect. Once you "know," or think you know, that they preyed on one person, it becomes much easier in the next case to read ambiguous (or nonexistent) evidence as proof that they did the same thing to someone else, which makes it still easier to draw the same conclusion in a third case, and so on. Pretty soon, everything they do is suspect, and every scrap of information about them further confirms their guilt.

This is the logic of every witch hunt, and it is on full display here. In the lead article, the reader "learns" of four victims, without being aware of any of the problems — such as the total lack of supporting evidence — I have identified. Then, in the followup piece, the reader encounters a half-dozen more stories, most of them completely innocuous, all of which (when combined) acquire a sinister glow in light of the "knowledge" from the original article. The reader now has an airtight case of two serial predators who remorselessly prey on unsuspecting men.

I need hardly point out how easily such a narrative sells (literally and figuratively) when it is about two nonconforming women, one of them a trans woman of color. An alarmingly large part of the public is eager to read "sinister" and "criminal" into practically anything they do (even using the bathroom, to recall the panic over trans women that swept the country four years ago). The false light cast by this work is therefore far more damaging for women like this than it would be for cis white people, who enjoy every benefit of the doubt in the public mind.

¹⁴⁰ As noted before, this was pointed out by their lawyer in a February 2020 filing in the civil litigation.

The upshot for these women is not hard to imagine. People from their past will reevaluate whatever favorable impressions they may have had. People in their present and future will want nothing to do with them. People who harbor prejudice against them will see their bigotry validated. People who consider them enemies will use the articles to hurt them. People who want money from them will use the articles as templates for blackmail. People will refuse to allow their children to play with the women's own children. And so on.

I cannot and will not lend my name to this travesty any further. I do not see how those associated with the magazine and its parent company — which includes some of my journalistic heroes — could want to do so either. For that matter, I do not see how any lawyer for a responsible media outlet could want to do so. You, your clients, and your parent company should take the steps necessary to ensure that this disaster does not happen again.

Kera Bolonik was unqualified to write this article, and should never have been assigned it. Beyond that, she has used it for purposes completely antithetical to the magazine's mission. The more she seeks to "unmask" Mischa by probing into her childhood, seeking salacious details about her pre-transition life, and deadnaming her to potential sources, the more your reporter reveals that she, not Mischa Haider, is the real imposter. Your reporter is falsely posing as a feminist, as a trans ally, as an ally to people of color, and as a journalist. Now that she has done very serious damage to innocent lives, her influential and well-connected friends may be tempted to cover up for her. They should resist the temptation. Her behavior, as I have demonstrated above, is inexcusable.

In closing, I would like to call attention to some of the harms these articles have caused, and are continuing to cause by remaining online. There is, first, the matter of the articles' impact on the lives of the women and their children. Just think for a moment about the four year-old boy who serves as the hook in your shameless "paternity trap" fiction. Has anyone associated with the magazine considered the effect these articles will have on his future? Were the clicks worth it?

There is, second, the matter of understanding the truth about the women's activism that, as I have suggested before, lies at the center of this story. Their "personal is political" stance has driven many of the events that have been so misunderstood by so many. Even many progressives will probably consider these women's values and ideas — their position that no degree of enabling of misogyny should be tolerated, their radical view on women's sexual agency, and their unconventional views on family structure — to lie too far outside the box. Far from being criminals or cult members, they simply have an unwavering and intense commitment to bringing change in unconventional and disruptive ways. That should be the subject of constructive and respectful discussion. Maybe these Weird Sisters' ideas will one day be mainstream. *New York* should not be demonizing them.

There is, third, the matter of Mischa Haider's voice and public presence. In this moment of collective reflection and calls for action against the oppression of those who are marginalized, it

is both tragic and infuriating to see what these articles have done to the life and reputation of a transgender mother of color — particularly this one. As I have said before, the example she sets — her loving relationship with her husband, her being mother to her three children, her intellectual and literary contributions and accomplishments — should make her a role model and inspiration for trans girls. It is her achievements and ideas that should be featured in your publication, not the false and dehumanizing pulp currently being circulated.

New York devotes much of its energies to calling out systemic racism and related injustices. It is therefore an intolerable irony that the magazine has silenced this extraordinary trans woman's budding voice in the way that it has: by publishing a false story that deploys every negative stereotype in the book to portray her as a serial victimizer of white cis people — a fictional tale coming from the false accusations of bigoted cis white people, written by a cis white woman posing as a journalist. It is as though the magazine were trying to enact every form of injustice that it normally opposes.

As I said before, some of those copied here are journalistic heroes of mine. I hope they encourage the magazine to do the right thing. As events in the past few days show, there is thankfully little appetite for attacks on marginalized people masquerading as free speech. It is writers like Mischa Haider who should be invited by *New York* to tell their stories if they choose to, or to offer insight on the issues we face at this troubled time. It is writers like her who should be publishing books about their lives if they wish to. That Mischa's voice has gone silent while Kera Bolonik reaps the rewards of True Crime character assassination is a sad illustration of the way our society keeps marginalized people from authentically telling their own stories. That cannot be what *New York* wants to be known for.

I will say it again. The only decent thing for your publication to do is take those articles down, find a way to address the harm they caused, and investigate this travesty honestly and thoroughly so that it never happens again. Transparency, integrity, and accountability: those should be your principles. Not clickbait, cronyism, and cover-ups.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a series of connected, stylized loops and a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Bruce Hay